

provided free are those used in the hospital and nursing home, and that each laboratory test and X-ray, provided on an outpatient basis, requires a \$20 deductible for each diagnostic study on an outpatient basis? The cost estimate for this feature is given as just 0.01. Do they know that the 240 visits promised as part of the home health services are anticipated to be in such short supply, because of the shortage of people capable of giving these services, that they are figured to cost only 0.05 percent of payroll? The major cost in the bill is, significantly enough, 0.52 percent of payroll for hospital benefits. These cost estimates—which most Americans understandably are not familiar with—are the fine print on the premium which is offered by the administration bill. We should look well to them.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when costs are mounting rapidly, is it wise public policy to enact legislation which, as we have seen, depends almost exclusively on treatment in a hospital as the means of providing medical care for our senior citizens? We know that hospital costs have increased by 109.7 percent from 1950 to 1961 and by the staggering figure of 376.8 percent from 1940 to 1961. They represent, by all odds, the greatest increase for the same periods of any kind of medical care. Physicians' fees, for example, increased by just 43 percent from 1950 to 1961 and the costs of prescriptions and drugs rose by just 16.7 percent during the same period.

With the alternative of relatively free hospital care as opposed to being charged for care in the doctor's office for a relatively minor ailment, how will the patient react? In his testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, Dr. Leonard Larson, representing the American Medical Association, posed the doctor's dilemma under such circumstances in the following words:

Pressure will be exerted by the patient and his family upon the doctor in an effort to force him to fit the treatment, willy-nilly, into the services provided by the program \* \* \*

Let us say that a patient needs treatment of a sort not covered by the program and therefore not reimbursable under it.

The physician is confronted with two unsatisfactory courses of action \* \* \*

On the one hand, he may follow his best professional judgment and refuse to recommend a course of treatment covered under the program. For example, he may decide the patient is better treated at the physician's office and that hospitalization is not required. In such a case, it is not unlikely

that the patient will go to another physician, hoping for a different professional judgment; or that he will postpone the treatment he needs.

Alternatively, the physician may accept the patient's plea that he can finance the cost of care only through the mechanism of H.R. 4222 (the administration bill), and then choose the lesser of two evils: treatment in an improper facility simply because it is covered by the program, or no treatment at all because the patient refuses to undergo treatment except at Government expense. In this case, the physician's medical decision has been influenced by nonprofessional considerations. Further, if the doctor accedes to the patient's request, however unwillingly, he risks censure by the "hospital utilization committee" and the possible rejection of his claim by HEW.

I do not claim, Mr. Chairman, that some individual patients might not receive perfectly adequate treatment under the program \* \* \* [because] the needs of their cases would fall within the bill's imposed limitations \* \* \*

But many of the aged will receive a lower quality of medical care simply because the services covered do not represent the full range of facilities required by the physician for optimal treatment. You cannot reduce the physician's armamentarium of treatment facilities without reducing the effect of his skill in the process.

Let us all be very clear that the bill advocated by the administration is limited not only as to the kind of protection it provides. It is also limited in the degree to which it can provide the kind of services it promises through lack of manpower and facilities. And, as I have said, it is limited as to its coverage, confining its protection capriciously and compulsorily to a selected group of the American people.

Now let us compare the limited coverage and benefit package provided in the administration proposal with the kind of protection which will become available under my bill. H.R. 11466 offers a choice between two plans which, according to reliable insurance carriers, could be purchased for \$125 a year. The first plan is keyed to hospital and nursing home care, including surgical charges, diagnostic, laboratory and X-ray services, and drugs used in hospitals. Payment of all charges under this plan are made by the insurance carrier for hospital room and board up to \$12 per day—for up to \$1,080 in a calendar year—for convalescent care up to \$6 per day—for up to \$186 in any calendar year—for surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a \$300 maximum, and for all other items listed above.

The second plan, which is subject to a deductible feature not to exceed 25 percent of costs, is broadly conceived to include doctor's services up to \$5 for each, surgical charges up to a \$300 maximum, unlimited hospital room and board for semiprivate accommodations, charges for drugs and medicines which require a doctor's prescription, blood or blood plasma not donated or replaced, anesthetics and oxygen, rental of durable medical or surgical equipment such as hospital beds or wheelchairs, diagnostic X-rays and other diagnostic and laboratory tests, X-ray, radium and radioactive isotope treatment, and up to \$16 per day for a registered nurse—for up to \$480 in any calendar year. This package further provides convalescent care up to \$6 per day—for up to \$540 for any calendar year—following discharge from the hospital.

And never forget that the substantially more adequate care provided through this means not only preserves the vital free-choice principle, but protects us against Government medicine by using the time-tested ability and experience of the voluntary insurance method.

Mr. Speaker, a spokesman for the aged themselves recently described the heart of our problem today. He said:

Our people feel that really they are given two alternatives. One alternative is, get rich. If you get rich you have the means for all kinds of medical care. But it is too late in the game for our people. They cannot get rich any more if they had not done it up to now. So they are given another alternative—get poor. But this they don't want. They don't like to get poor. Our States and cities are saying if you get poor the welfare department will take care of you.

My bill will make it possible for all of the older people in these circumstances to afford the kind of protection they deserve and must have without recourse to a visit to the welfare office. They can obtain this protection in a manner they understand and are accustomed to using—the familiar income tax form. And they can do so in a manner which preserves their self-respect as well as their health. I urge enactment of this legislation during this session of the Congress. Enough with claims, counterclaims, circuses, and commercials. We have, at long last, a sound, safe, and typically American solution for the problem which, all of us agree, faces our senior citizens. Let us put it to work.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all being, again in Thy bountiful mercy we bow at this altar of Thy grace with the sure confidence of Thy

servant, the Psalmist of old, as he poured out his soul, declaring "At noon, I will pray and call aloud and the Lord shall hear my voice."

Speak to us and through us, that we may be the channels of healing good will for this tangled and tragic time.

O Thou Kindly Light, lead us on through the passing shadows to the effulgence of Thy coming kingdom's sway, when it shall be daylight everywhere.

In the spirit of the Master we pray. Amen.

## DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 29, 1962, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. MCINTIRE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

- H.R. 1347. An act for the relief of Adolf M. Baller; and  
H.R. 5652. An act for the relief of Kevork Torolian.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 638) for the relief of certain aliens who are serving in the U.S. Armed Forces.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 107. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes;

S. 971. An act for the relief of Salvatore Briganti;

S. 3157. An act to repeal subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, limiting the area in the District of Columbia within which sites for public buildings may be acquired;

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Sydney Gruson;

H.R. 1404. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina;

H.R. 1712. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rose DiCarlo;

H.R. 2103. An act for the relief of Antonio C. Ysrael;

H.R. 2672. An act for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith;

H.R. 2839. An act for the relief of Mildred Love Hayley;

H.R. 4783. An act to grant constructive service to members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve for the period from July 25, 1947, to November 1, 1949;

H.R. 8368. An act for the relief of A. Eugene Congress;

H.R. 8570. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit disbursing officers of

an armed force to entrust funds to other officers of an armed force;

H.R. 9466. An act for the relief of Sfc. Jesse O. Smith; and

H.R. 11261. An act to authorize an adequate White House Police force, and for other purposes.

## HENRY FOUNTAIN ASHURST

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it was with deep sadness and a sense of profound loss that I learned of the passing yesterday of Henry Fountain Ashurst, who was one of Arizona's first two Senators, and who served with distinction in this body from April 2, 1912, until January 3, 1941, a period of more than 29 years. I came over from the House of Representatives in 1927, and enjoyed his friendship, confidence, and cooperation for the following 13 years.

One of the first burdens placed upon us was to defend the rights of the State of Arizona in the use of the waters of the Colorado River, which we did in a filibuster against the enactment of the Swing-Johnson bill to authorize the construction of what is now the Hoover Dam.

We did not prevent the building of that great structure, but I am pleased to say that the arguments we then advanced were found to be justifiable in the findings made by the master selected by the Supreme Court of the United States to report upon the issues involved in the case of Arizona versus California now under consideration by the Justices of that Court.

In my five decades of public life, I have known perhaps a thousand public figures who have achieved prominence. They included Presidents of the Republic; Senators and Representatives; Governors and State legislators; business leaders and labor leaders. None of them exceeded Henry Ashurst in the humility of greatness, the passion for justice, the devotion to his native land, and the loving kindness that the prophets of old commanded man to show to his fellow man.

In electing Henry Ashurst and continuing him for nearly 30 years as its U.S. Senator, the then youngest State of our Union earned the admiration and the respect of her sister States. No longer could it be suggested that erudition and wisdom, urbanity and wit, could not be found west of the Alleghenies.

On the occasion of his 80th birthday, Henry Ashurst said that at that age a man has atoned, or tried to atone, for the wrongs he has committed, and has forgotten the wrongs, if any, committed against him. Of Henry Ashurst it can be said that he did not have to reach 80 to make such an affirmation. The concluding words of his published diary declare:

It is a comforting assurance that nothing in this diary will cause pain to any living person or bring reproach to the memory of anyone who is dead.

That is indeed the epitome of Henry Ashurst.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I was deeply grieved yesterday to receive news of the passing of my old friend and Arizona's great former Senator, Henry Fountain Ashurst. This was a tremen-

dous loss to the State of Arizona and to the America which he loved so deeply. To me, it was a heavy personal loss. Senator Ashurst was a beloved friend who exercised much influence on my life, both personally, and politically.

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

## TRANSFER OF ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Secretary of Defense, relating to the transfer of the Alaska Communication System (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

## REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL OFFICE SPACE

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report to the President by the Ad Hoc Committee on Federal Office Space (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

## REPORT ON CONTRACT FOR APOLLO SPACECRAFT

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on a contract for the Apollo spacecraft; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

## INCREASE OF OBLIGATIONS UNDER SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase temporarily the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

## REPORT ON REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of administration of mining claims located on national forest lands reserved from the public domain, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN RESIDENTS OF TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## REPORT ON FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A letter from the executive director, The American Society of International Law, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the financial transactions of that society, for the period April 1, 1961-March 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is in receipt of a communication, with an accompanying copy of a resolution of the House of Representatives of the Republic of the Philippines, relative to the Philippine war damage bill pending before the U.S. Congress.

If there be no objection, the Chair will lay this matter before the Senate, and refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; ordered to lie on the table:

## "HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27

"Whereas agriculture remains the No. 1 industry in the State of Louisiana, farm-level receipts from farm marketing(s) being \$399,877,000 in 1961; and

"Whereas agriculture in Louisiana has made remarkable progress in recent years through its ability to supplement its row crops with livestock and livestock products, such livestock and livestock products accounting for \$147,690,000 in cash receipts to Louisiana farmers in 1961; and

"Whereas it is estimated that without limitations imposed by the Federal Government upon the freedom of choice of Louisiana producers, the number of beef-brood cows in our great State may double in the next decade from its present level of 850,000 head; and

"Whereas the dairy industry in Louisiana is now able to furnish the citizens of this growing State with an adequate supply of fresh milk which is unparalleled in its quality and wholesomeness, and provides Louisiana dairymen a farm-level income now approaching \$80 million annually; and

"Whereas legislation now being considered in the Congress of the United States, H.R. 11222, known as the administration's farm bill, could severely restrict the growth and prosperity of these industries seeking to impose restrictions on the amount of milk which can be produced within the State of Louisiana, and by putting a definite limitation, with penalties, on any further expansion of the livestock industry in Louisiana by limiting the freedom of each farmer to produce feed grains for such livestock; and

"Whereas the 1962 farm bill contains further provisions to permit the Federal Government to take over farmlands, to convert them into recreation areas or for other 'more economic uses' other than agricultural which are not defined, and which also contain provisions for enforced land reform patterned after agrarian reform policies similar to those in Cuba and China: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana (the Senate concurring),* That each and every member of the Louisiana congressional delegation is respectively urged to vigorously oppose and vote against the enactment of the administration's 1962 farm bill in its present form, or any legislation which would further impair the income or freedom of farmers in this State and the American free enterprise system; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the clerk of the house of representatives be and he is hereby directed

to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the majority and minority leaders of both Houses of Congress and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide medical care for the aged under the social security system; to the Committee on Finance.

## RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, CRAWFORD COUNTY, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kans., unanimously adopted a resolution in regard to the report of the Presidential Railroad Commission as filed with the President of the United States on February 28, 1962.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CRAWFORD COUNTY, KANS.

Whereas this commission of Crawford County in the State of Kansas, duly assembled, has considered the report of the Presidential Railroad Commission filed with the President of the United States on February 28, 1962; and

Whereas this commission finds that the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission, if given effect, would reduce the number of jobs of railroad engineers, helpers (firemen), conductors, brakemen, and switchmen by nearly half, with resultant serious impairment of safety and efficiency of railroad operations, would require more work of employees at lower rates of pay, would deprive railroad operating employees of the fruits of collective bargaining gained in many years of negotiation, and would also, by reason of abolition of existing railroad terminals in Kansas and elsewhere, destroy many railroad communities and cause the dislocation of homes of thousands of railroad workers; and

Whereas it is the sense of the members of this commission that in these times any proposal producing additional unemployment, longer working hours at lower rates of pay, the decimation of railroad communities in Kansas and elsewhere, as well as impairment of railroad safety, service, and efficiency, is un-American, injurious to our national and local economies, contrary to established trends in labor relations, and deteriorative of the general well-being of our country, and must be condemned as such: Therefore be it

*Resolved, and it is hereby the decision of this commission,* That the report of the Presidential Railroad Commission of February 28, 1962, be disapproved and condemned as an unfair, inappropriate, and ruinous proposal for settlement of the wages and work rules disputes on the Nation's railroads; and be it further

*Resolved,* That existing controversies between the railroads and their employees concerning wages, rules, and working conditions ought to be resolved in collective bargaining,

without regard for the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission, on bases which will maintain existing jobs and improve and enhance wages and working conditions of railroad employees. A copy of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Governor of Kansas, State senators and representatives, and the presidents of the rail unions involved.

D. J. SAIA, Chairman.

## REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 7061. An act to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide for payment for unused compensatory time owing to deceased postal employees, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1539); and

H.R. 7416. An act to authorize the Bureau of the Census to make appropriate reimbursements between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1540).

## BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3366. A bill to require disclosure of the effectiveness of filters on cigarettes distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 194. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multi-State authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PELL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## RESOLUTION

## INVESTIGATION OF FAILURE OF INDIVIDUALS TO COMPLETE THEIR EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS OR COLLEGES

Mr. WILEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 348) to investigate failure of individuals to complete their education in schools or colleges, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. WILEY, which appears under a separate heading.)

## A CHEESE CHARCOAL CIGARETTE FILTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a citizen of my State is of the opinion that a

cheese charcoal filter for cigarettes would reduce the nicotine and tar content from the cigarette smoke. He claims to have proof of the effectiveness of such a filter.

After reading an article published in the June issue of the Reader's Digest, on a finding by the British Royal College of Physicians in regard to the effect of cigarette smoking on health, I am introducing at the request of my constituent a bill to inquire into the effectiveness of cheese filters on cigarettes.

I ask that the Reader's Digest article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Let me say that my constituent claims that a cheese charcoal filter has been perfected, and the laboratory work on it is completed. He says that the utilization of cheese for it would be in such quantity that it would have a very beneficial effect upon the dairy products surplus problem. This follows my idea that commercial utilization of the constituents of milk would aid in solving the milk surplus problem.

The Reader's Digest article should cause us to stop, look, and listen; and this bill should be appropriately referred, and hearings on it should be had. Not only is the health of our people involved, but this practical suggestion for handling our surplus dairy products problem merits careful study.

Mr. President, I now introduce the bill, and request its appropriate reference; and I submit the article from the Reader's Digest, and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3366) to require disclosure of the effectiveness of filters on cigarettes distributed in commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The article presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

**LUNG CANCER AND CIGARETTES—HERE ARE THE LATEST FINDINGS**

(Britain's Royal College of Physicians examines the effect of smoking on health and issues a clear and stern warning.)

(By Lois Mattox Miller)

Out of London last March came a chill blast which sobered cigarette smokers and jolted the tobacco industry on both sides of the Atlantic. The venerable 444-year-old Royal College of Physicians, which never deals with trivia or sensationalism, completed an exhaustive study and published a fact-filled report, "Smoking and Health," intended to give to doctors and others, evidence on the hazards of smoking so that they may decide what should be done.

The Royal College report stated unequivocally:

"Cigarette smoking is a cause of lung cancer and bronchitis, and probably contributes to the development of coronary heart disease and various less common diseases."

"Cigarette smokers have the greatest risk of dying from these diseases, and the risk is greater for the heavier smokers."

"The many deaths from these diseases present a challenge to medicine; insofar as

they are due to smoking they should be preventable."

"The harmful effects of cigarette smoking might be reduced by efficient filters, by leaving longer cigarette stubs, or by changing from cigarette to pipe or cigar smoking."

The report had immediate repercussions in Parliament. It also stirred some nervous activity in Washington, where bureaucrats and Congressmen have dodged or pigeon-holed the smoking-health issue for the past 10 years. Tobacco industry spokesmen issued the standard rejoinder that the evidence was merely "old data without new research findings," but the statement sounded weaker and more pathetic than ever.

Sir Robert Platt president of the Royal College of Physicians commented: "Naturally every possible opposition has been raised to the idea that these diseases are due to cigarette smoking. But not one of the opposing theories will hold water whereas everything confirms the evidence against cigarettes."

**SMOKER'S LUNGS**

"During the past 45 years" the report explained "lung cancer has changed from an infrequent to a major cause of death in many countries. To account for this increase it is necessary to postulate some causative agent to which human lungs have been newly and increasingly exposed during the present century. Cigarette smoke is such an agent and there is now a great deal of evidence that it is an important cause of this disease."

Since 1953 at least 23 investigations in 9 different countries have reported on the relationship between lung cancer and smoking. "All these studies" the report states "have shown that death rates from lung cancer increase steeply with increasing consumption of cigarettes. Heavy cigarette smokers may have 30 times the death rate of nonsmokers. They also have shown that cigarette smokers are much more affected than pipe or cigar smokers (who do not inhale) and that the group which had given up smoking at the start of the survey had a lower death rate than those who had continued to smoke."

This strong statistical association between cigarette smoking and lung cancer is supported by compatible though not conclusive laboratory and pathological evidence. "Some 16 substances capable of initiating cancer in animals have been identified in tobacco smoke. In addition to these carcinogens the smoke contains a variety of irritants which cause precancerous changes. These have been noted in the lungs and bronchial tissues of smokers who have died of causes other than lung cancer."

**ADDRESSED TO DOUBTERS**

The Royal College report devotes a full section to the theories advanced by those who doubt the cause-and-effect relationship. "None of these explanations fits all the facts as well as the obvious one that smoking is a cause of lung cancer."

How about air pollution, onto which the tobacco propagandists try desperately to shift the blame? In "Smoking and Health," the investigators point to the lung-cancer death rates of smokers and nonsmokers who live in cities, in rural areas and even in countries where air pollution is virtually unknown.

Finland, for example, which has the second highest lung-cancer death rate in Europe is essentially a rural country which has little air pollution but a population of heavy smokers. "This suggests that smoking is more important than air pollution," the report concludes. Moreover, "it is clear that at all levels of air pollution cigarette smokers suffer a risk of lung cancer which increases with the number of cigarettes smoked, and even in the most rural areas of the United Kingdom heavy cigarette smokers develop lung cancer 15 to 20 times as frequently as nonsmokers."

**SMOKER'S COUGH**

Chronic bronchitis is a frequent cause of death, particularly among middle-aged and elderly men, as well as a common disabling disease. The disease usually starts with persistent coughing and the production of phlegm (productive cough). Then the bronchial tubes become infected and, eventually, persistent breathlessness may develop. In many cases the infection and breathlessness bring on heart failure and death.

"Smoking causes cough and expectoration," the report states. "Most people with smoker's cough lose this symptom when they stop smoking. Many studies have shown that the lungs of smokers are, on the average, impaired compared to those of nonsmokers, particularly with respect to bronchial airflow. Dr. W. Richard Doll and Professor (Sir Austin) Bradford Hill found a steady increase of bronchitis deaths among heavy smokers. Those who smoked more than 25 cigarettes a day had a death rate from bronchitis six times greater than that of nonsmokers. In the United States, Dr. Harold F. Dorn found that death from bronchitis and emphysema was three times as frequent in regular cigarette smokers as in nonsmokers."

Cigarettes may not be the sole or chief cause of bronchitis, the report emphasizes; other factors, chiefly air pollution, probably play a part. But "cigarette smoking often causes productive cough which predisposes to the disabling and fatal forms of bronchitis under the influence of other factors. Cigarette smoking should be regarded as an important contributing factor rendering many men and women liable to a disease which they might have escaped had they not smoked."

**SMOKER'S HEART**

Coronary heart disease is a more frequent cause of death among cigarette smokers than among nonsmokers. But the British report does not find evidence that cigarette smoking is a cause of coronary heart disease. Nonsmokers, too, commonly have coronaries although "those who give up smoking have a reduced death rate."

"The association of coronaries with smoking," the Royal College finds, "is clearest in middle age; and then various other factors such as mental strain, sedentary occupation, and indulgence in fatty foods, which are thought to increase liability to coronary thrombosis, are also commonly associated with heavy smoking. It seems reasonable at present to agree with the recent statement of the committee on smoking and cardiovascular disease of the American Heart Association, that present evidence 'strongly suggests that heavy cigarette smoking may contribute to or accelerate the development of coronary disease or its complications,' at least in men under the age of 55."

**SMOKER'S ULCER**

Tobacco smoke has demonstrable reactions in the stomach and intestines. Gastric hunger contractions, for example, cease after a few puffs on a cigarette. Nonsmokers seem to have better appetites than smokers; and ex-smokers commonly put on weight as soon as they quit the habit. While there is no evidence that smoking causes gastric or duodenal ulcers, most physicians have seen an adverse effect of heavy smoking on patients who already have stomach ulcers.

The Royal College report states that the "effect of smoking on the healing of gastric ulcers has been carefully recorded in a controlled study in Britain." Hospital patients with gastric ulcers (all smokers) were divided into two groups. Group A was told to quit smoking, group B was not; otherwise, both received the same medical treatment. "It was noticeable that in patients who continued to smoke, the ulcer actually increased in size while this deterioration was not observed in any of those who gave up smoking." The conclusion: "Smoking does not appear

to be a cause of ulcers in the stomach and duodenum but probably exacerbates and perpetuates them."

#### THE WORD TO DOCTORS

"Patients with bronchitis, peptic ulcer, and arterial disease should be advised to stop smoking," the Royal College suggests to doctors. "Even a smoker's cough may be an indication that the habit should be given up."

The report observed that the proportion of nonsmoking British doctors has doubled in recent years from 24 percent in 1951 to 50 percent in 1961. "The doctor who smokes cigarettes must, like any other individual, balance these risks against the pleasures he derives from smoking and make his choice. But the doctor who smokes will lessen the effect of public education concerning the consequences of the habit and will find it harder to help his patients who need to stop smoking."

#### PREVENTIVE MEASURES

The Royal College report is not the first comprehensive analysis to be made of the smoking-health problem. But it is probably the best factual statement, buttressed by over 200 citations of scientific sources, to be written in the plain English which the average layman can understand. (Besides being widely summarized in the British press, the first 15,000 copies of "Smoking and Health" were sold out on publication day and it since has become a paperback best seller.)

"Smoking and Health" is also the first report to spell out a practical program of preventive measures for the individual and the Government. Some specific recommendations:

More public education, and especially of schoolchildren, concerning the hazards of smoking. "The Central Council for Health Education and local authorities spent less than \$5,000 (\$14,000) in 1956-60, while the tobacco manufacturers spent \$38 million (\$107 million) on advertising their goods during this period. Such public education might advise safer smoking habits (filter-tips, longer stubs, preference for pipes or cigars) for those whose addiction is too strong to be broken."

More effective restrictions on the sale of tobacco to children ("cigarettes are freely available in slot machines"). Wider restrictions on smoking in public places.

Raise the tax on cigarettes, and perhaps lower taxes on pipe tobacco and cigars. ("Pipe smokers incur a considerably smaller risk than cigarette smokers. The risk in those who smoke only cigars is even smaller and may be no greater than that for non-smokers.")

"Since filters vary in efficiency, it would be desirable to have them tested by some official agency and have the results indicated on the packet."

The Royal College report was immediately subjected to full Parliamentary discussion, and Enoch Powell, the minister of health, informed the House of Commons: "The Government certainly does accept that this demonstrates authoritatively and unquestionably the causal connection between smoking and lung cancer and the more general hazards to health of smoking." The report's recommendations, he said, "are under consideration by the Government."

#### WHITHER WASHINGTON?

The forthright British approach was in sharp contrast to the timidity with which the health services, regulatory agencies and legislators in Washington, D.C., have shied away from the clearly defined issue of smoking and health. In 1959 the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service published in the Journal of the American Medical Association a lengthy report which covered much the same ground as the current Royal College report, and accepted the causative role of ciga-

rettes in lung cancer. But, unfortunately, some of the Surgeon General's colleagues had written into the report a brief paragraph which downgraded and dismissed filtertips even as partial health protection, and the Federal Trade Commission seized upon this convenient excuse to sweep the whole issue of the tar and nicotine content of American cigarettes under the carpet.<sup>1</sup>

There have been, however, a few faint but encouraging signs of a change of heart. Dr. Michael B. Shimkin of the National Cancer Institute has come out publicly in support of the American Cancer Society's proposal for a Federal regulation requiring that all packages be clearly labeled with the tar and nicotine content of the cigarettes.

Following the publication of the Royal College report (but only then), it was disclosed that a House Appropriations subcommittee had heard the testimony, in closed sessions, a month earlier, of physicians from the National Institutes of Health. They stressed the overwhelming evidence linking cigarette smoking with lung cancer and other diseases, and urged an educational campaign on the hazards of smoking.

The FTC, apparently, has been holding its own closed-door meetings to find some way out of its quandary. The trade paper, Advertising Age, quoted Byron H. Jacques, head of the FTC bureau of trade practice conferences and industry guides, as admitting: "If there is really a significant difference in the health hazards involved in filter-tips compared with nonfilters, some change in our attitude might be necessary."

The FTC has long argued that it needs scientific authority and new legislation to handle the job properly. But many well-informed Washington lawyers maintain that the Federal Government (Food and Drug Administration, FTC, or USPHS) has all the authority it needs under present laws, including the broad Federal Hazardous Substances Act, which went into effect in July 1960. Many cigarette manufacturers state, privately, that they would welcome package labeling and standardized testing but (for sound legal reasons) only if the Government takes the initiative and tells them what to do.

So the question is: Who will take the initiative? Perhaps we shall have to wait until (as seems likely) the British set the precedent and shame us into following their lead. Meanwhile, this observation in a well-known British medical journal, the Lancet, should be pondered in Washington: "Future historians will have views on our failure to find even a partial solution to the problem of smoking during the first 10 years after its dangers were revealed. The enormous and increasing number of deaths from smoker's cancer may go down in history as a strong indictment of our political and economic ways of life."

#### COMPACT TO ESTABLISH A MULTI-STATE AUTHORITY TO OPERATE A RAIL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM BETWEEN WASHINGTON AND BOSTON

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in connection with my recent statement concerning rail passenger service between Washington and Boston, I submit for appropriate reference a Senate joint resolution which would grant the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a

compact to establish a multi-State authority to modernize and operate a passenger rail transportation system along the present right-of-way between Washington and Boston.

Mr. President, it is my strong belief that the establishment of a multi-State authority to operate this passenger service would represent a long-range solution to the rail passenger needs along this line. It is not enough to gage our sights at somehow managing to get through another 3 months or even 3 years. It is, indeed, also high time that we take advantage of technological advances which are available to us. A serious and detailed study of the very best modern facilities should be made. There is no reason why our citizens should not be afforded comfortable, fast, air-conditioned and noiseless travel, which is not only essential to their well being, but also to the prosperity of this region, which contributes such a large proportion of the wealth and industry of our Nation.

The general reaction to my recent proposal has been most heartening. In fact, 10 newspapers up and down the eastern seaboard between here and Boston, have supported all or part of this proposal. I am more than ever convinced that practical aspects and feasibility of the plan should be further explored and implemented.

Mr. President, I very much hope that the Congress will soon take favorable action on this joint resolution for I am convinced that its passage would stimulate the States concerned to move forward on the negotiation of the compact so that a multi-State public authority could be established at the earliest practicable date. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 194) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multi-State authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Pell, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the eastern seaboard area containing the eight States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, is rapidly becoming a megalopolis, and now has a population of over 37,000,000, and contains almost 30 percent of the Nation's manufacturing and 21 percent of the Nation's retailing establishments, as well as the Nation's Capital;

Whereas this area is now serviced by a multitrack system of railroads which for the most part have sufficient rights-of-way to provide adequate passenger transportation throughout the area, but the railroads involved have not been able to provide such passenger service on a paying basis and must

<sup>1</sup> See "Facts We're Not Told About Filter-tips," the Reader's Digest, July 1961.

rely on profits from freight transportation to keep their entire systems operating;

Whereas it therefore appears that a Government authority must be organized to provide such passenger service which is essential to the welfare of the Nation as well as the area involved, and that the existing railroads would continue to provide necessary freight transportation; and

Whereas it appears that a multi-State authority formed by the States involved would be the best type of governmental authority to carry out this passenger rail transportation function: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and to the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact for the purpose of establishing a multi-State authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. Such consent is given upon the following conditions:

(1) a representative of the United States, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, shall participate in such negotiations and shall make a report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into; and

(2) such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the States involved or upon the District of Columbia unless and until it has been ratified by the legislature of each of such States and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

#### CONVENTIONS OF GENERAL CONFERENCE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive C, 87th Congress, 2d session, which are conventions adopted by the General Conference of the International Labor Organization, and were transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States. I also ask that the President's message be printed in the RECORD and, with the conventions, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

#### *To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a convention (No. 116) concerning the partial revision of the conventions adopted by the General Conference of the International Labor Organization at its first 32 sessions for the purpose of standardizing the provisions regarding the preparation of reports by the governing body of the international labor office on the working of conventions. Convention No. 116 was adopted at the 45th session of the International Labor Conference, at Geneva, on June 26, 1961.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report of the Secretary of State regarding this convention, together with a copy of a letter addressed by the Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 1, 1962.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State, (2) certified copy of ILO Convention No. 116, (3) copy of letter from the Secretary of Labor.)

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, June 8, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Oliver Seth, of New Mexico, to be U.S. circuit judge, 10th circuit, vice Sam G. Bratton, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

#### SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday last, I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered at the DeVry Institute, on May 24. The title of it was "National Calamity of Dropouts." When I began to study this subject, I was thoroughly shocked to learn how many of our children drop out of school. Russia's current rate of technical training should cause us to pause; she is producing engineers at the rate of approximately 126,000 annually, while we are producing only 45,000. Red China's enrollment is going from 117,000 to 660,000. It must be clear that in the terms of defense requirements and of space exploration requirements, our need for expanded technical education is urgent. We remember that Khrushchev said, "We will bury you."

As a Senator, I am disposed to view the dropout as a serious threat to our national survival. There was a time when the defense of our Nation depended upon the brawny arm, the hardy constitution, the steely courage of the minuteman at Lexington, the gunner aboard the U.S.S. Constitution, the Rough Rider charging up San Juan Hill, the devildog Marine going over the top at Chateau-Thierry. The next war will not be waged with muskets or cutlasses or cavalry sabers or Springfield rifles. It will be won with intercontinental missiles, space ships, antimissile rockets, and with such world-wrecking atomic weapons that in thinking about them the mind recoils in horror.

So, Mr. President, I feel that we had better know more about school drop-

outs. We should study the situation and determine what can best be done. A clear reason for urgency in the expansion of technical education is the fact that automation has changed from a mammoth concern of the future to a mammoth concern of the present.

Therefore, in my talk I announced my intention to submit a resolution to investigate the national calamity of dropouts, their character, and their causes, and to have the committee to which the resolution is referred seek the means of eliminating them.

Mr. President, the youth of Wisconsin and of all of America represent one of the greatest and most precious assets of our national life.

The future of our Nation, of freedom itself, and of the ideals in which we believe depends upon the maximum development, utilization, and dedication of the talents and genius of our youth—the hope of the America of tomorrow.

Fundamental to a sound youth-development program, of course, is our educational system. Despite nationwide efforts to improve it and to increase the opportunities for youth, a special problem plaguing our progress is the too-great number of dropouts from our school system.

For this reason, I now submit a resolution to authorize a congressional study of the dropout trend in our educational system. Such a study would, I believe, not only help us better understand the involved problems, but also would enable us to ascertain the best ways to halt this trend.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and a statement of its purpose be appropriately referred and be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with several letters which I have received since I delivered the address.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution, statement, and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 348) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of the failure of many individuals to complete the level of education which they had been pursuing in the public and private schools in the various States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, through January 31, 1963, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on

Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

The statement and letters presented by Mr. WILEY are as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The future progress and security of our Nation will depend upon a reservoir of well-educated, well-trained citizens.

Currently, the United States is attempting to improve its educational system so as to provide the educated, skilled, trained manpower needed for the space age. A special problem confronting the Nation is that of dropouts from school—at grades 6-8, high school, and college level. According to a recent study, for example, about 35 percent of the students enrolled in high school drop out before graduation. Unless such trends can be curbed, the country may suffer serious consequences.

#### NEED FOR PUBLIC AWAKENING

Realistically, the challenge confronts us, as individuals—including both parents and students—as well as a nation.

The youth of America—who may be inclined to drop out—should be confronted with such facts as: The competition for better jobs is greater today because the majority of young people are high school graduates; finding a job is more difficult for a nongraduate; the nongraduate is not promoted as fast as the graduate; most occupations—law, medicine, engineering, teaching, selling, almost any one you can name—require first the broad education background represented by a diploma and then specialized training; the less skilled workers are of declining importance in the Nation's total working force (from 1940 to 1957, the number of workers employed in considered to be less skilled occupations, for example, dropped from 30 to 16 percent); the high school graduate earns more money; during his adult earning years, the graduate will receive an estimated \$49,000 more than the eighth grade graduate, and \$30,000 more than the high school dropout.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY

For national security, also, maximum education is necessary. The Armed Forces report that during World War II—700,000 young men were rejected for military service because they could not read or write. In addition, 700,000 with little or no education were accepted for low-level assignments.

As guardians of freedom, graduates are better able to absorb military technical training; have a better opportunity to be selected for military schooling; have a better opportunity for advancement in rank; are better equipped to assume positions of leadership.

#### INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

The United States, too, is entering into a new phase of the industrial revolution—the era of automated production, requiring still more new and advanced skills of American workers. For the years ahead, for example, the wheels of progress will be powered, more and more by atomic energy. In 1960 about 210 atomic reactor operators were at work; by 1980 an estimated 18,670 will be required. Only high school graduates are accepted for training for these highly technical fields.

Industry, too, needs more engineers—one for every 40 workers (in 1900, the ratio was

one for 400 workers). For every professionally-trained engineer, industry needs, on the average, a crew of five trained technicians.

#### OUTLOOK IN PROFESSIONS

The professions, also, need more highly-trained personnel. By 1965, we will probably need 45,000 more doctors; 75,000 more college trained nurses; 485,000 more elementary and high school teachers and 120,000 more college teachers; 80,000 more natural scientists; 100,000 more engineers.

#### CONCLUSION

For the individual, then knowhow—acquired by education and training—may spell the difference between failure and success. According to manpower experts, the economy has barely enough trained and educated people now to make full use of day-to-day discoveries in almost every field—nuclear energy, electronics production, construction, aviation, transportation, medicine, etc.

Unless the Nation's manpower is developed to the maximum extent through education and training, we will not fully realize the great future possible for our country.

By conducting a special study, the Congress, I believe could make a real contribution toward: (a) Creating a broader knowledge of, and concern about, the cause of dropouts; (b) make recommendations for curbing the trend; and (c) serve the best interests of the individual, and the Nation.

HERBERT M. KRAUS & Co.,  
Chicago, Ill., May 29, 1962.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We note with interest your address at the DeVry Technical Institute dinner last week. You may be interested in learning that Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc., has launched its first 4-year high school design to cope with the dropout problem, as well as to utilize to their fullest, the resources of gifted children, in Chicago.

Heading up the new Academy for Adults is Gordon G. Dupee, onetime president of the Great Books Foundation. Mr. Dupee has some very challenging observations to make on the subject of school dropouts. We know you would be interested in talking with him.

If you plan to be in Chicago again in the immediate future, we would be most happy to have you visit with Mr. Dupee in the new school; otherwise, he would be able to see you either in Washington or in Wisconsin any time after June 14.

Incidentally, the chief executives of the Encyclopaedia Britannica and Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc., will be in Chicago for a press conference on the new school, on June 12. The press conference will be followed by an open house of programed learning for guidance counselors and school administrators on June 14. If your schedule permits, we would be most happy to have you join us on either of these occasions. The June 14 open house particularly would give you an opportunity to visit at length with a number of educators who are very close to the school dropout problem.

May we congratulate you on your proposed investigation of the school dropout problem. Such an investigation is bound to produce tangible results of benefit to American youth and indeed to the entire economy.

Very sincerely,

DAVID M. JOHNSTONE.

DEVRY TECHNICAL INSTITUTE,  
Chicago, Ill., May 28, 1962.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In coming to Chicago and talking to over 200 high school

and college educators about the student dropout problem, you have done a big favor to the people of America and particularly those of the central West.

We have had numerous phone calls and some letters concerning further interest in the dropout problem and know you have started a wave of thinking which can have untold beneficial results.

For the entire DeVry Tech organization, including both Mr. DeVrys and myself, let me thank you very kindly for the big favor you have done for all of us.

Best wishes to both Mrs. Wiley and yourself and lots of luck on the fall campaign.

Cordially yours,

T. J. LAFEVER,  
President.

#### STEEL'S PROFIT PROBLEM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a speech entitled "Steel's Profit Problem," delivered by Allison R. Maxwell, Jr., president of the Pittsburgh Steel Co., at the general meeting of the American Iron & Steel Institute, in New York City, on May 24, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STEEL'S PROFIT PROBLEM

(By Allison R. Maxwell, Jr., president, Pittsburgh Steel Co.)

A few months ago, when I was invited to talk here, I reviewed previous talks made from this podium, and found them interesting reading. Down through the years, many of the greatest leaders in the steel industry have passed along to us some of the soundest practical wisdom and business philosophy ever presented to any industry. And, time and again, throughout their talks, these steelmen forewarned us of impending crises.

I knew then this talk would be a challenging assignment. For my subject, I selected "Steel's Profit Problem." And I began to prepare an analysis of the industry's profit trends for a talk full of more forewarnings.

Then, during the days that followed, a series of events occurred. An avalanche of Government abuse and coercion, triggered from the White House, came roaring down on us. We were engulfed in a crisis of historic proportions. My subject—"Steel's Profit Problem"—suddenly became a matter of national interest. Yet far more than profit is involved. We are locked in a crucial battle—not only for our economic welfare as an industry—but for preservation of our freedoms.

I hope you will bear with me, therefore, when I use this occasion to enlarge on my subject. Circumstances demand it.

I want to make it clear from the outset, that I am speaking here this morning, not as a spokesman for this industry, and not as the president of a company that has been subpoenaed, or as an individual who has been subpoenaed—at least not until this talk has been completed.

The contents of my talk have not been cleared, approved, or controlled in any way by any officials of other steel companies. I am speaking as president of one of the smaller companies in the industry; and the thoughts expressed here are strictly my own. My theme is this:

First, the steel industry is faced with grave economic problems. While we have grown and flourished on competition, today we are competing in the toughest market contest

we have ever encountered. Not only do our companies compete with each other, but we are beset by competition from foreign steel producers, and from other materials.

To hold and expand our markets, we must be able to offer the users of steel quality products and superior service at competitive prices. This requires tremendous new investment in ultramodern facilities, to make better steel at lower cost. The money to finance this investment is ultimately derived from just one source—profits.

Rising costs have been outstripping prices for many years now, gradually whittling our profits away and weakening our capabilities. Increasing our profit, therefore, is our imperative No. 1 objective—the essential key to the future welfare of our industry.

Second, the steel industry is faced with equally grave political problems. Steel is one of the mighty bulwarks of private enterprise that has made our Nation great. Yet today, we are the central target for Government regimentation.

The opponents of competitive enterprise have grown immensely powerful. With flagrant disregard for facts, they can now denounce, discredit, and vilify business leaders before the public—employ the combined forces of Federal police power and purchasing power, and resort to legislative inquisition, for purposes of coercion—and have their assault spearheaded by the highest office in the land.

Steel has long tried to do its part in preserving the economic freedoms that have made ours the greatest industrial Nation in world history. But perhaps we have been deluded by believing the benefits are so great—in peace and in war times—that they must also be self-evident. Now we have conclusive proof that we have not done enough to establish these benefits in the court of public opinion.

So if we hope to see private enterprise survive, our course of action must begin to marshal public opinion more effectively. We must carry our story to our employees and shareholders, to those who represent us in Washington, and to 185 million Americans—with every resource at our command.

At the same time, we must oppose with equal vigor the efforts of a tiny handful of Government officials whose pursuit of power over business and industry exceeds their understanding of the public interest, and shows utter disregard for the constitutional principles on which this country has been founded.

#### COMPETITION

Now, let's turn first to the economic problems that confront us, beginning with competition. All of the steel companies represented here compete in the total market for steel—a market that has become worldwide in scope, and a market that is expanding.

But the U.S. share in this expanding market has been shrinking. Foreign competitors are displacing us in markets abroad, and invading our markets at home. If we had maintained our 1953-57 average participation in world export trade, and prevented further import erosion, we would have shipped 6 million tons more than we actually shipped during 1961.

This 6 million tons means loss of \$1.2 billion in annual sales volume. It has lopped some 50,000 jobs off our payrolls, and cost steelworkers over \$300 million annually in wages. Technological unemployment? Yes. But due to technological advances by our competition.

Since 1950, world steel production has doubled, increasing from about 200 million to 400 million tons a year. Nor is this all. World capacity will expand to more than 500 million tons a year by 1965.

So, if our progress has been inadequate to cope with competition from these mills in the past, it will be even less adequate in

the future. This prospect should vitally concern everyone who is interested in maintaining the industrial supremacy of this great Nation.

Now why has this occurred? Since the end of World War II, our Government has, in effect, been subsidizing our competition. Foreign producers have been able to build their tremendous steel capacity largely as a result of direct and indirect U.S. aid.

On the one hand, Government foreign policy is encouraging and partially paying for development of free world economic concentrations, cartels, and free trade associations that compete with individual U.S. businesses. In steel, we find ourselves beleaguered by foreign competitors who are equipped with modern facilities, favored by tax advantages in their own countries, guided by coordinated planning and control, and manned by low-cost labor. They have decisive advantages.

On the other hand, Government restrictions on business here at home are equally specific. Steel is hampered by disadvantageous tax provisions; harassed into accepting high labor costs, as five lengthy and exhausting strikes since World War II will amply attest; harried by Government interference in pricing policies; and proscribed from engaging in any coordinated program to meet the competition.

There can be no question about the need for foreign aid or for free trade among nations—for the welfare of our country and of the free world—as the Soviet offensive looms ever more threatening.

But there can be no defense for Government policies embracing free trade with one hand, and simultaneously wrecking the chances for U.S. industry to compete in free trade, on fair and equal terms, with the other.

Now, how can we recover and expand our markets, increase employment and improve job security, discharge our responsibilities to our shareholders and to the steel industry, and perform our patriotic duty to our Nation more effectively?

#### PRICES AND COSTS

In steel's markets, the customer is king. He buys on the basis of quality, service, and price.

So, each individual steel company is acutely aware of the functions of pricing; more so than some outsiders who pose as experts on this subject. For nearly 4 years now, there has been no general increase in steel prices. This fact reflects competition in today's markets.

But while prices must be low enough to hold today's markets, they must also be high enough to build the markets of tomorrow. Prices have a double role to play in competition. They must be attuned to the immediate; and they must also help provide profits to buy superior tools for lower costs and competitive prices in the long-range future. Prices reflect a delicate balance of both short- and long-range competitive requirements, far too intricate for manipulation by the heavy hand of government.

The cost-price squeeze on profits has become increasingly intense over the past 12 years. Undeniably, we have been gaining productivity. If we didn't, we would be presiding at our liquidation. But the gains have been buried by wage increases that outstrip the productivity advance by more than 9 to 1.

Even the latest agreement exceeds by 50 percent the average annual productivity increase since 1940. And this agreement does not become noninflationary just because the administration puts that label on it. It is not a noninflationary agreement just because it is less inflationary than previous agreements. It is, in fact, just one more increment in an inflationary trend that has been long developing.

We hear from Washington that wage increases should equal productivity gains. This is an insidious doctrine. Raises have exceeded productivity gains by such wide margins, and for so many years in the past, that increases equaling these gains are already being paid well in advance and for many years to come.

Yet, productivity springs primarily from investment in better production tools. Today, when we are faced with a critical need for more and better tools, this doctrine would deny us greater use of the fruits of progress for investment.

More productivity gains must carry through to profit, so that productivity will continue to gain—and gain by leaps and bounds—if we are to surpass our competition. All answers to the threat by competition revolve around rapid improvement of production tools and unrestricted freedom to market our products profitably.

For some unexplainable reason, these two inseparable concepts do not enjoy equal popularity. Nearly everyone will agree to the need for new and better equipment. Proposals to spur capital expenditures win popular acclaim. But suggest that industry must generate more profit to build new plants, and this arouses controversy.

#### PROFIT TRENDS

Steel industry profits have been scored repeatedly by a distinguished array of critics. Politicians, labor leaders, pseudoeconomists, and many well-known socialist propagandists have at various times denounced our profits as "exorbitant," "shameful," "fantastic," and even "fabulous." Even recent industry profits (in the range of \$700 to \$800 million a year) are cited as evidence of "unconscionable gouging." Excessive profits have been the bane for attacks on steel by those who seek to extend the coercive control of Government over private business.

And now this time-tested, antibusiness strategem is being used again. The White House points to the profits of a few companies, for one or two quarters, labels them among the highest on record, and implies that we are profiteering.

This charge, however, has never gained much acceptance with the financial community and investing public. They view our profits as a 5- to 6-percent return on our current \$13.7 billion in total investment, and on our annual sales volume in the range of \$13 to \$14 billion; and they fail to find the glamor in it. They appraise our financial record, and regard our profits as uncertain and sporadic. Some are beginning to question the wisdom of all steel investments.

And so we find profits—indisputably the essential prerequisite to progress—surrounded by confusion and misunderstanding. The very word evokes political emotions, when this serious hour calls for objective study of the facts. The course of future legislation, therefore, will depend in large measure on this industry's ability to create greater understanding of our profit problem.

To this end, I would like to offer here this morning a new approach to understanding profits. It is not my intention to overwhelm you with statistics; but the problem is not simple. My purpose is to present steel's profit problem as it relates to economic forces.

Profit analyses are most commonly based on time comparisons. For example: what did the industry make in 1961 as compared to 1960, or in 1961 versus 1955 or 1950? But when profits are analyzed using time as the basis for comparison, some important facts are concealed.

Profits do not fluctuate because of time. They are directly related to economic forces—the most important being: (1) cost-price relationships, and (2) volume. For

many years now, each round of wage increases, and consequent adjustments in the cost-price relationship, have eroded our earning capacity. So this analysis will take the cause-and-effect approach—providing a before-and-after look at what has happened to our profits.

First, to reflect the influence of cost-price relationships, we can select four periods during these past 12 years: 1950-51, 1953-54-55, 1957-58, and 1960-61. These periods were free from strikes—the strikes having occurred before each period—and reflect the aftereffect on cost-price relationships.

Second, to reflect the influence of volume, we can use quarterly sales in each of these periods. This lets us evaluate profits at many more levels of sales activity, for valid comparisons. Analysis of industry earnings for one or two quarters—by a few companies—White House style—is not nearly so revealing as study of the earnings of 36 separate quarters at 36 different volume levels—showing the average trend for 576 quarterly returns by 16 companies representing 87 percent of the industry.

Chart No. 1 [not printed in RECORD]: Here is a chart showing the profit path for these companies during the eight quarters in the 1950-51 period. You will notice the base of the chart represents quarterly sales in billions of dollars. The vertical scale shows profit as a percent return on invested capital. To determine profits, quarterly pre-tax returns have been uniformly reduced by the 52 percent income tax rate to avoid the distortions caused by changes in tax regulations; and annualized to present a correct relationship to invested capital. So, they provide a valid basis for comparison of performance.

Each dot on this chart represents profit for a certain quarterly sales volume. For example, the first dot on the left shows that industry profit at a quarterly sales volume of \$1.8 billion amounted to a 9 percent return on invested capital. The last dot on the right shows that profit at a quarterly sales volume of a little over \$2.6 billion amounted to a 14 percent return on invested capital. The diagonal line through these dots shows the calculated profit-volume path for 1950 and 1951, following the 45-day strike in 1949.

Chart No. 2 [not printed in RECORD]: Here are the 12 quarters during the 1953-55 period—following the 59-day strike in 1952. You will note that the first dot on the left shows profit at a quarterly sales volume of \$2.2 billion, amounting to just over 6 percent return on invested capital. At right, profits on quarterly sales in the range of \$3.4 billion amounted to a 13 percent return on invested capital. The diagonal line represents the calculation of our profit-volume path for these years.

Chart No. 3 [not printed in RECORD]: Here is our profit-volume path for the eight quarters in the 1957-58 period, following the 36-day strike in 1956. You will note that the first dot on the left shows profit at a quarterly sales volume of \$2.5 billion, amounting to just over 4 percent return on invested capital. At right, profits on quarterly sales of about \$3.7 billion amounted to just under 12 percent return on invested capital.

Chart No. 4 [not printed in RECORD]: Finally, we come to our profit-volume path for the 8 quarters in the 1960-61 period, following the 116-day strike in 1959.

Chart No. 5 [not printed in RECORD]: Gentlemen, here is what happened to our profit path during these past 12 years. Note the descending levels of return on investment following each change in the cost-price relationship. Here is the result of the cost-price squeeze. Here is irrefutable evidence of the erosion of our profit potential. Let's analyze this chart.

Chart No. 6 [not printed in RECORD]: Let's compare profits during periods of equivalent sales volumes over these 12 years. On quarterly sales volume in the range of \$2.6 to \$2.8 billion: our profit amounted to a 14.4 percent return on investment in 1950-51. It declined to 8.9 percent in the 1953-54-55 period. It slipped to 5.9 percent in 1957-58; and reached 3.7 percent during the 1960-61. On the same sales volume, our profit as a return on investment is approximately one-fourth of what it was 12 years ago.

Chart No. 7 [not printed in RECORD]: Let's compare profits at an equivalent range of return. Let's take the 10 to 12 percent range for example. In the 1950-51 period, we could generate this return on average quarterly sales of \$1.9 billion. To generate this return during 1960-61 required average quarterly sales in the range of \$4 billion—or double the sales volume required 12 years ago.

Gentlemen, this analysis conforms to established accounting practice in every detail. From an accounting standpoint, the evidence is unassailable. Further analysis will show that profit returns on sales follow the same trend. We have dwelt on returns on invested capital, because they relate to the availability of funds for new equipment.

However, the practice of picking up figures out of context, and misusing them to distort the truth, seems to have become a popular pastime among industry critics. So let's summarize this study with a more conventional approach.

Chart No. 8 [not printed in RECORD]: This chart shows the specific net profit return on invested capital, taken from annual reports for the same 16 companies. Note that we have preserved the same cause-and-effect time periods for our before-and-after look at profit returns as they relate to growth in investment. The bars show how capital investment has climbed during these past 12 years—increasing from \$5.8 billion in 1950-51 to an average of \$11.6 billion in 1960-61. The line shows what has happened to our average after-tax profit as a percent return on investment. It has dropped from 11.1 percent to an average of 9.7 percent following the 1952 strike—to 8.6 percent following the 1956 strike—and finally to 5.8 percent following the 1959 strike.

Gentlemen, I realize that any analyst can lift a simple dollar transaction into the dim and mystic realm of confusion. I submit that there can be no confusion here. These are unvarnished facts. And ugly as they may appear, they must be faced; and we must probe still deeper to assess their true significance.

Some proponents of big government can look upon these facts with joy. They see our loss of earnings as evidence of victory for what they term the "public interest." But if it is a victory, according to their socialistic precepts, it will be short lived.

The true interests of the public are not served by loss of profit, because profit is the wellspring of growth. When profits fall, funds for new investment vanish. When profits rise, investment funds abound.

#### FUNDS FOR NEW EQUIPMENT

Let's see what has occurred in steel. Let's look at the effect of waning profits on funds required to replace wornout and obsolete equipment; and funds required to modernize with new equipment—new equipment that will reduce our costs to competitive levels.

To begin with, dig into the profit trends we have explored and you will find that they are inflated. In part, they represent capital erosion. Allowances for replacement of facilities are understated because of tax rules and accounting practice in the reporting of depreciation allowances.

Over the past 12 years, construction costs have risen 66 percent. We have needed far

more depreciation than we have been allowed, just to stay even—just to keep abreast of the wear and tear on existing facilities. Amendment of tax regulations to permit realistic depreciation policies is long overdue.

Tax regulations providing anything less than full replacement allowance, in current dollars adjusted for inflation are not enough, if we are to compete on fair and equal terms with foreign producers. And as noted speakers from this platform have repeated, time and again, fair provision can't come soon enough.

In the absence of adequate depreciation allowances, we have been forced to rely more heavily on profits for income to reinvest—just to stay even. But as we have already seen, profits are shrinking.

So we have gone beyond this, and resorted to heavier borrowings. We have gone still further and sold stock. To the extent that borrowings and the sale of stock have been required to make up for capital erosion, we have increased our debt load, diluted stockholders' equity, and heavily mortgaged future earnings. Yet we have been unable to keep pace with our favored foreign competition.

Liberalized depreciation rules and tax credit legislation now before the Congress will, without question, serve to ease this problem. But they will not provide the total answer as some would lead us to believe. They will aid us in the future, but do not make up for inflation in the past. So they do not change our problem: to meet our competition, we must increase our profits.

#### THE ROUTE TO SOCIALISM

Gentlemen, let's turn now from economics to the political arena. By reviewing economic trends, we can do some Monday morning quarterbacking, and move to change them in the future. But let's not count on being Monday morning quarterbacks in the game of politics. Few have ever found a way to replay the game that we're engaged in now.

Contrary to popular belief, socialistic governments do not spring up overnight. Change from a democracy to government by regimentation is seldom quite that rapid. The transformation comes gradually, by stealth. Trace the histories of countries swallowed by dictatorship, and you will find this common pattern:

A closely knit clique acquires power by slowly and tentatively expanding their sphere of control, watching signs of public reaction, pausing and changing their tactics, then moving relentlessly onward—until they gain unrestrained power. Sometimes, the final seizure is quite sudden, but it has always been a long time in the making.

For many years now, since the days of the New Deal, observers have been warning us, sometimes from this very platform, that America is losing its freedoms, and moving in the direction of socialism. Now listen to this newspaper report from just 6 weeks ago:

"The arsenal of weapons the President wheeled into his all-out economic foray against big business leaders was an awesome display of coldly determined political and economic power seldom, if ever before, employed by Government. Every major governmental department got into the act."

You will recall the circumstances. United States Steel Corp. had raised its prices. To discuss the merits of the United States Steel decision here would be inappropriate, and totally irrelevant. But the issue it has raised is of vital importance to each of us, and to all free citizens. One very noted and respected commentator put it this way:

"Is this democracy, or is it the forerunner of a quasi-Fascist system? Is it a government under a written constitution; or is it a government by usurpation of legislative authority?"

When the White House was informed of United States Steel's price raise, the newspapers factually reported that businessmen could now expect all hell to break loose. The White House clique displayed its fury. But what is more significant, it did so in a way implying dire consequences: let the Nation tremble; retribution is at hand.

And what is more profoundly disturbing, few considered it to be important that no law had been violated. Yet United States Steel, and other companies which increased their prices competitively, were treated as transgressors.

The indictment: their actions did not conform to the public interest as viewed by the administration. Their crime: they did not obey some nebulous higher law—a set of guidelines the administration alone can define and enforce, without benefit of legislation—the law of the New Frontier.

Now we have some insight into what this new law means. It means sacrifice of traditional freedoms. Few seem to recognize that in the administration's appeal for sacrifice in the name of its concept of public interest, we are being asked to deny the fundamental freedoms that are basic to democracy.

We may decry specific power tactics, but these are merely symptoms of an issue far more fundamental and decidedly more dangerous. It would be an error to dismiss these actions as merely antibusiness; when the real issue is that big government is anti-individual rights.

The obvious direction of all of its policies is toward a form of socialism in which the pretense of private property is retained, while in fact, prices, wages, production and distribution are dictated by bureaucrats.

As of the present moment, the administration will not dare to advocate price or wage controls openly. It knows the public would repudiate such policies. What it seeks, therefore, is to be the unofficial arbiter of wages and prices. It imagines—or pretends—that it will confine price and wage control to critical industries such as steel, while leaving the rest of the economy relatively free.

But controls breed controls. Every act of Government intervention into free markets produces harmful consequences. And then, the choice of Government becomes: Abandon intervention, or extend it further. Inevitably the choice will be extension. And the result: More and more controls, more and more regulations, to get us over crises and emergencies which Government policies have actually created.

People fall prey to socialism by failing to recognize the signs of its approach soon enough; by failing to oppose the growing restriction of freedoms until it is too late—sometimes through ignorance, sometimes through moral cowardice, sometimes through suicidal belief that they will be able to profit from it. We cannot afford to let this happen to us.

#### THE TASK AHEAD

Now let's summarize. Let me remind you first, the remarks I offer are strictly my own. They have no endorsement by American Iron and Steel Institute or by any member companies. Yet, it is my deep conviction that this statement must be made.

The economic problem this industry faces is grave. We must generate more profit—in the tradition of a free market economy—and use it wisely.

We cannot permit slow strangulation of our profits—as we are caught in the crush between rising costs and competitive prices—to choke off our progress, to weaken our market position and to take further toll in wages and unemployment. We must meet this problem head on. The need for greater

profit is exceedingly important to the long-range welfare of the steel industry and to the public interest of the Nation we serve.

We must modernize more rapidly to reduce costs, to recover markets in the future, and ultimately to surpass our competition. We must pay more dividends to restore investor confidence, and to attract more funds to build up more efficiency. And our success will be recorded in the cold figures on our profit statements.

The political problem we face is equally as grave. In this serious hour in our Nation's history, when we are confronted with grave crises abroad, when our Government is asking servicemen to risk their lives, I am sure you will find it hard, as I do, to accept a situation in which a tiny handful of Government officials, in their pursuit of monopoly power over business and industry, undermine the profit system that has made our Nation great, and the very constitutional freedoms they have sworn to uphold.

By what principle under the Constitution, or by what act of Congress, does this oligarchy set prices, malign free citizens, and unleash retaliation against those who do not conform to their decrees against pursuit of private business enterprise?

Sixteen months ago, the Nation asked this administration to defend the Constitution and the principles for which it stands. Six weeks ago, we had our answer.

I am sure you will find it hard, as I do, to witness the powers of regimentation we are seeking to defeat abroad, now threatening our way of life at home; to witness Government's inflationary overspending, and find inflation blamed on industries that must—by economic law—confine their spending to the limits of their balance sheets; to hear an appeal for restraint, and witness those who voice the appeal, deny by their actions, that this applies to them; to hear demands for sacrifice, when the sacrifice they seek is freedom.

Many hundreds of thousands of steelmen, who have given their lives on the battlefield, or fought to preserve our freedoms, or produced the overwhelming tonnages of steel to bring us victory, down through the great conflicts of modern warfare, must view in mute amazement the spectacle presented, when their patriotic sacrifice is ridiculed by this administration.

Despite this effrontery, we must continue to do our part and more, for the economic welfare and the public interest of the Nation we have helped to build. We must cooperate with Government to do this job effectively. We cannot permit the misguided ambitions of a few to defeat these vital objectives. And we would indeed be derelict in our duty to all steelmen, and to our Nation, if we did not strive, with every effort we can muster, to defend our freedoms.

Cooperation must result from greater understanding—of the problems steel faces—of our resolution to resolve them. And to serve the public interest best, cooperation must be based on mutual respect for the traditions of our American heritage.

#### HOWARD COUNTY, TEX., DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION PRAISES PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY AND THE DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at a recent county convention of the Howard County, Tex., Democrats, held at Big Spring, Tex., a resolution was passed May 12, 1962, commending President

Kennedy and the Democratic administration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution signed by Frank Hardesty, chairman of the Howard County Democratic Executive Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION, HOWARD COUNTY DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, BIG SPRING, TEX.

Whereas the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, shows a complete understanding of the problems of our country both domestic and foreign; and

Whereas since President Kennedy took office in January 1961, action has become synonymous with Washington; and

Whereas our Nation is now definitely moving in the right direction in regard to living up to our responsibilities in both foreign and domestic matters; and

Whereas this Democratic administration clearly shows that it has the interest of the people at heart in its action to stop inflation and the spiraling cost of living; and

Whereas the Gallup poll shows that 78 percent of the Nation approve the way that our President is handling his job: Be it therefore

*Resolved by the Howard County Democrats in county convention assembled this 12th day of May 1962, That we concur with the majority of the people of the United States in supporting the firm hand of a strong President and are responsive to his bold leadership in domestic and international affairs, and we commend likewise our distinguished U.S. Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, and our most capable Congressman GEORGE MAHON for the part they have played in making this Democratic administration such a successful and progressive administration.*

Passed May 12, 1962, in county convention.  
Certified by:

FRANK HARDESTY,  
Permanent Chairman.

#### LATEST SURVEY OF WHOOPING CRANE POPULATION OF WORLD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. Noel Pettingell, of Hazlet, N.J., living far removed from either the breeding range of the nearly extinct whooping cranes in Canada, or their wintering grounds in Texas, is yet one of the foremost authorities on the whooping cranes' fight for survival.

Through the courtesy of ornithologist Victor Lloyd Emanuel, of Houston, himself an authority on the Eskimo Curlew, I have received Mr. Noel Pettingell's latest compilations, tables, and notes on which his whooping crane population summary is based, and Mr. Pettingell's permission to use them.

In view of the fact that more species of wild birds are found in Texas than in any other State—100 more species than the next richest State in number of species of wild birds—that the first national convention of the Audubon Society ever to be held in Texas will be at Corpus Christi this fall, and that the projected Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area has stimulated interest in the rich avifauna of the lower Texas gulf coast, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point Mr. Noel Pettingell's summary and notes on

the whooping crane, under the title "Whooping Crane Population Summary." There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Whooping crane population summary*

[Compiled by Noel Pettingell, 8 Mirlam Place, Hazlet, N.J.—January 1962]

I. ANNUAL POPULATION TOTALS: 1938-61

Year	Total world population <sup>2</sup>	Texas-Canada flock <sup>3</sup>			Louisiana flock <sup>4</sup>		Birds in captivity	
		Total <sup>1</sup>	Adults <sup>1</sup>	Young	Adults <sup>1</sup>	Young <sup>1</sup>	Adults <sup>1</sup>	Young <sup>1</sup>
1938	30	18	14	4	11		1 (Nebraska)	
1939	36 (3)	22	15 (3)	7	11	2	do.	
1940	34 (7)	26	21 (1)	5	6		2 (Nebraska and Louisiana)	
1941	23 (13)	15	13 (13)	2	6		do.	
1942	26 (1)	19	15 (0)	4	5		do.	
1943	27 (4)	21	16 (3)	5	4		do.	
1944	27 (3)	22	19 (2)	3	3		do.	
1945	29 (1)	25	22 (0)	3	2		do.	
1946	29 (3)	25	22 (3)	3	2		do.	
1947	34 (1)	31	25 (0)	6	1		2 (Louisiana)	
1948	34 (3)	31	28 (3)	3	1		2 (Texas)	
1949	37 (1)	34	30 (1)	4	1		do.	
1950	33 (0)	31	26 (5)	5	(9)	(9)	do.	
1951	27 (11)	25	20 (11)	5			2 (Louisiana)	
1952	23 (6)	21	19 (6)	2			do.	
1953	26 (0)	24	21 (0)	3			do.	
1954	23 (3)	21	21 (3)				do.	
1955	30 (1)	28	20 (1)	8			do.	
1956	27 (5)	24	22 (6)	2			3 (Louisiana and Texas)	
1957	31 (2)	26	22 (2)	4			do.	2
1958	38 (3)	32	23 (3)	9			5 (Louisiana and Texas)	1
1959	39 (1)	33	31 (1)	2			6 (Louisiana and Texas)	
1960	42 (3)	36	30 (3)	6			do.	
1961	45 (3)	38	33 (3)	5			do.	1

Total offspring, Texas-Canadian flock (1939-61)..... 96  
 Total adult losses, Texas-Canadian flock (1939 versus 1938 to 1961 versus 1960)..... 76  
 Net gain, Texas-Canadian flock (1938-61)..... 20  
<sup>1</sup> As of Dec. 31.  
<sup>2</sup> Adult losses (versus preceding year) in parentheses.  
<sup>3</sup> Migratory.  
<sup>4</sup> Nonmigratory (White Lake, Vermillion Parish).  
 \* Louisiana flock extirpated by end of 1950.

II. SUPPLEMENTARY DATA BY YEAR SINCE 1938

1938: Annual crane census begun at Aransas Migratory Waterfowl Refuge (now Aransas National Wildlife Refuge), approximately 35 miles northeast of Corpus Christi in southeast Texas.

1940: "Josephine" (now "Jo"), a Louisiana flock cripple, captured and placed in Audubon Park Zoo, New Orleans. (Note.—Only other crane in captivity—"Pete"—was found crippled at Gothenburg in south central Nebraska in May of 1936.)

1946 (?): Captive "Pete" transferred from Gothenburg, Nebr., to zoo at St. Louis, Mo.

1946: Two young birds of Texas-Canada flock remained on Aransas refuge during summer.

1947: Aransas flock total (31) includes 1 male ("Crip") injured in February and consequently unable to migrate north to Canadian breeding grounds. Captive "Pete" transferred from St. Louis to Audubon Park Zoo, New Orleans, where only other captive, "Jo," is also confined.

1948: Captives "Pete" and "Jo" transferred from New Orleans to Brackenridge Park Zoo in San Antonio, Tex., thence (in October) to Aransas refuge where they are confined within a 145-acre tract surrounded by a 9-foot fence. Aransas flock total (31) includes nonmigrant "Crip" and 2 on Matagorda Island (east of refuge). One non-crippled female remained at Aransas refuge during summer.

1949: Captive "Pete" dies July 21 at Aransas refuge (15 or more years old). "Crip" captured and placed in enclosed area on Aransas refuge with only other living captive "Jo." World population total 37 is highest since start of census in 1938. (Note.—Total was 38 prior to death of "Pete" in July.)

1950: "Crip" (4 or more years old) and "Jo" (12 or more years old) produce. First whooping crane born in captivity on May 24 at Aransas refuge ("Rusty"), but chick only survives 4 days (killed by predator—raccoon?). Last survivor of Louisiana

flock, "Mac," is transferred to Aransas refuge March 11 but is killed by predator in September while in semicaptive state (10 or more years of age). Possible total whooping crane population prior to September: 42.

1951: Captives "Crip" and "Jo" transferred from Aransas refuge to Audubon Park Zoo, New Orleans in December.

1952: World population total equals lowest since start of census in 1938: 23 (in 1941).

1954: Nesting grounds of Aransas flock discovered June 30 in southwest northwest territories, western Canada (west of where Sass River empties into Little Buffalo River in northeast Wood Buffalo National Park, south of Great Slave Lake, in southern district of Mackenzie). World population total gain equals lowest (23 in 1952 and 1941) since start of census in 1938.

1955: First Canadian nest in 33 years found on May 16 in Wood Buffalo Park. (Previous record: Muddy Lake, 7 miles south of unity, southwest Saskatchewan in southern Canada on May 28, 1922.) Aransas flock total (28) includes 18 birds on refuge, 6 adults and 1 young-of-year on Matagorda Island, and 3 birds on Mustang Island, 5 miles south of Port Aransas (east of Corpus Christi) and some 28 miles south of Aransas refuge.

1956: "Crip" and "Jo" produce second and third whooping cranes ever born in captivity (first since 1950) at Audubon Park Zoo, New Orleans, but chick which hatched May 29 dies July 13 from lung disease while chick born May 31 is killed by predator (owl or rat?) June 3. Adult female "Rosey" found crippled near Lometa, Tex. (between San Antonio and Fort Worth) is captured and transferred to Brackenridge Park Zoo, San Antonio (see also 1948) about June 6; she is fourth captive whooper since 1936 and second female since 1940. Texas-Canadian flock loss of six birds includes "Rosey," one young (of 1955) male which did not migrate to Canada but last noted at Aransas on July 17, and four other birds which did not return to the refuge from the Canadian breeding grounds.

1957: "Crip" and "Jo" produce fourth and fifth whoopers born in captivity—"George" (hatched May 18) and "Georgette" (hatched May 21)—at Audubon Park Zoo, New Orleans; first two captives to survive entire year (oldest previous: 45 days—first chick born in 1956). One of two Aransas adults which did not migrate north to Canada died at the refuge in June; another adult failed to return from breeding grounds in fall.

1958: "Crip" and "Jo" produce offspring third year in row: sixth whooper (name?) born in captivity (third to survive entire year) is hatched April 30 at New Orleans, thus 4 adults and 1 young in Louisiana plus 1 adult in San Antonio equals total of 6 captives; 18 adults and 9 young on Aransas refuge plus 5 adults on Matagorda Island (as of December 27) equals 32 in Texas-Canadian flock; 32 plus 6 equals 38—highest year-end world population total since start of census in 1938. (Note.—One additional young-of-year at Mingo National Wildlife Refuge, southeast Missouri until December 17, thus 39 birds known to exist as of this date; possible 41 alive prior to December 17, including Mingo bird and 2 adults lost during year.)

1959: Approximately 22 adults and 2 young at Aransas plus approximately 9 adults on Matagorda and St. Joseph Island (east of refuge) after November 1, plus 6 captives equal total of 39—new record high (at year's end, since 1938) for second consecutive year.

1960: "Crip" and "Jo" produce seventh and eighth whoopers born in captivity (May 17 and c. May 20), but neither chick survives. (Note.—Jo laid six eggs in 1960.) Known world population total 42 as of December 31 is new record high (since 1938) for third consecutive year. (Note.—Possible 45 birds survive prior to November 15.) Aransas flock total 36 is new record high (since 1938). Two Texas-Canadian migrants remained on Matagorda Island during summer.

1961: "Crip" and "Jo" produce ninth whooper born in captivity April 17 (name?)—their fourth surviving offspring. Seven captive cranes (five adults and one young at New Orleans plus one adult female at San Antonio) plus 36 migrants (including five young-of-year) at Aransas refuge and vicinity equal a total of 45 individuals surviving as of December 31—a new record high (since 1938) for fourth consecutive year. (Note.—Possible 48 alive prior to December 13.) Aransas flock total 38 is new record high (since 1938).

III. GENERAL INFORMATION

Probable maximum population: 1,300 to 1,400 (up to c. 1860).<sup>1</sup>

Life span: Feral birds, 7 years (average). Captives, nearly 40 years (maximum).

Migration periods (extreme dates): Leave Aransas Refuge, Tex., c. March 27 to May 8. Arrive Wood Buffalo Park, Canada, c. April 17 to May 29. Leave Wood Buffalo Park, c.

<sup>1</sup> R. P. Allen comments as follows with regard to the relative abundance of the whooping crane: "It may seem astonishing that few early travelers encountered the whooping crane, but we now believe that it has been comparatively rare since the early Pleistocene" (i.e., c. 1,000,000 B.C.—N.P.). Excerpt from Allen's "Whooping Cranes Fight for Survival" in Nov. 1959 National Geographic magazine. Another pertinent observation is offered by James C. Greenway, Jr., in his book "Extinct and Vanishing Birds of the World" (1958), as follows: "It is often confused with the sandhill crane (G. canadensis), with which it associates on migration \* \* \* apparently errors in identification \* \* \* caused ornithologists to believe the birds were much more common than they actually were between 1923 and 1933, causing protection to be delayed too long."

September 19 to November 9. Arrive Aransas Refuge, October 12 to c. February 1.

Flying time to and from breeding grounds (approximately 2,500 miles). Aransas refuge to Wood Buffalo Park: Approximately 3 weeks. Wood Buffalo Park to Aransas: 3 weeks (adults) to 6 weeks (young).

Breeding periods of captive birds: Aransas, c. April 21 to May 4. New Orleans, c. February 14 to May 21.

Basic sources of information on whooping crane (*Grus americana*): "National Audubon Society Research Report No. 3, 'The Whooping Crane'" (published July 1952 and containing data through 1949 and early 1950). "A Report of the Whooping Crane's Northern Breeding Grounds" (1956) (a supplement to research report No. 3). Both these publications were compiled by Robert Porter Allen who is the foremost authority on the species and who held the post of research director for the National Audubon Society from 1954 to 1960.

#### HEART-WARMING RESPONSE TO CHINESE REFUGEE PLIGHT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, following some discussion we had here on the floor the other day regarding the desire that the United States do its share with other free nations in helping to solve the problem of refugees from Red China, I received two or three critical letters asking why I wanted to bring more Chinese into this country when we already have an unemployment problem.

I hold in my hand the answer to that argument.

The Hickey-Freeman Co., of Rochester, N.Y., one of the Nation's leading clothing manufacturers, has just informed me that it is ready to offer employment to 150 Chinese refugees as tailors, hand sewers, and sewing machine operators. This offer has the support of labor and plans are already underway to making housing available for the refugees.

In their wire to me, the company indicates that its offer is prompted by "economic and humanitarian" motives. I commend this firm for its action and hope it will serve as an inspiration to others throughout the country and the world.

We sometimes forget that even in areas of unemployment, certain skills may be in short supply. This is the practical aspect of the company's offer. If it can get the tailors and other people it needs rather than taking jobs from Americans in the area, it actually would be opening up new opportunities for local residents with supporting skills. It will be breaking an employment bottleneck.

I remember when this company needed skilled cutters and brought in 100 from Italy. It was estimated that for every 1 brought in, 11 jobs were made for other people. I know that this is a problem in the men's clothing industry, and have been trying to assist both labor and the manufacturers obtain the needed skilled employees from around the world for many years.

The humanitarian aspect of the company's offer is more apparent. Unfortunately, the free world—which has been stirred by the plight of the refugees from Communist China—has not been stirring in its response. Instead of doing every-

thing possible to build a bridge to freedom, the British, with the apparent approval of the United States, have erected a wall and even appealed to Peiping to stem the flow. We have thereby largely forfeited an opportunity to demonstrate decisively and dramatically the ability and willingness of the free world to help those communism has dismally failed.

Perhaps the offer of Hickey-Freeman will have an impact on our policies in this area by demonstrating that the American people are willing to do whatever is necessary to combat communism and help fellow human beings in need.

#### PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the executive secretary of the Montana District Council, Lumber and Sawmill Workers' Unions, Mr. Robert C. Weller of Kalispell, Mont., recently furnished my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], myself, and Representative OLSEN, with his comments on the presentation of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association to the Congressional Conference on American Lumber Industry Problems and Solutions.

On behalf of my colleague, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, Mr. Weller's perceptive comments, and pertinent portions of the industry's presentation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LETTER FROM ROBERT C. WELLER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, MONTANA DISTRICT COUNCIL, LUMBER & SAWMILL WORKERS UNIONS UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO, KALISPELL, MONT., APRIL 18, 1962

First of course, there is an import problem, but I am amazed that the industry concentrates all of its thoughts on Canadian imports and completely overlooks not only the imports of Japanese plywood but the fact that Washington and Oregon logs are being shipped to Japan to produce the plywood. Plywood is fast replacing common lumber in most phases of construction. The difference seems to be that the American lumber industry or its plywood channels completely control the sale and distribution of Japanese plywood, and therefore make a greater profit on it than on American plywood.

They don't point out to the Congress that American mills have not been able to compete in the log market and have laid off hundreds of American workers. Neither do they point out that the large plywood monopolies shut down huge mills without notice, and lay off hundreds of workers from time to time, while supplying the market with a Japanese product. Of course, they're not able to control the distribution of Canadian lumber or profit by it, so they complain about it. Their complaints to a great extent are justified, all of their proposed solutions are not.

We would favor import controls by quota provided they apply to Japanese imports and other imports as well as Canadian.

We favor restricting shipments in transit because these shipments lead to distress dumping. American railroads have banned them, Canadian railroads have not, but these cars do come into the United States at some point or other, and there should be a way

to regulate such shipment by the U.S. Interstate Commerce Commission.

We favor the Department of Commerce arranging and even supervising conferences between lumber industry representatives of the two countries and also of other countries such as Japan.

We do not favor regulation of Canadian or other imports by tariff, believing that this leads only to price protection and higher prices at the expense of the consumers. We believe quota imports to be a better solution if regulation is needed.

We are not authorities on the manipulation of currency, and we don't believe the lumber industry is either. Neither would we trust their motives in this particular direction.

We favor a requirement of American-made products, including lumber, in all projects federally or State financed or insured, or involving public contracts in anyway. We recall that the new Montana Unemployment Compensation Building has an interior finish of imported Japanese paneling and an exterior finish of imported Japanese tile.

We favor any possible study of possibilities of greater export of American manufactured products, but not forest products as such, believing that this would open the door to further exportation of American logs rather than American finished products.

We favor prominent marking of foreign-made wood products, and in this connection point out "made in Japan" is printed so small that it is overlooked by most purchasers of plywood.

We do not want lumber or wood products, including logs, included as "agricultural commodities" under any act, and we very vigorously oppose Mrs. HANSEN'S H.R. 11136. This is a gimmick to set aside a Fair Labor Standards Act, and probably a considerable amount of other Federal legislation as being inapplicable to the lumber industry. We favor instead legislation to take all present forestry activities of the Department of Agriculture and transfer them to the Department of the Interior, which more properly deals with natural resources.

We view with concern the four proposals made by the industry on February 21 to the Secretary of Agriculture, keeping in mind these matters are dealing with public-owned timber that the industry more and more seems to consider their own private personal property. We hope the Secretary of Agriculture continues to take little action on the proposals.

We very particularly oppose the industry's proposals for any system having for its purpose the lowering of timber appraisal prices by the Forest Service.

The lowering of Forest Service appraised prices on public-owned timber will result in the small private timber owner having to sell at lower prices. Conversely the large timber owners in the lumber industry such as J. Neils, Anaconda, and Diamond would not sell one stick of their own timber at today's appraisals.

No timber is being sold at the appraised prices. The very operators that complain loudest about appraised prices are outbidding each other far and above the appraised prices, and I think that the public is entitled to a good high price for its timber, just as the large timber holders demand and get a good high price for theirs.

Certainly, timber is valuable property these days, and the timber owned by the public should be just as valuable as anybody else's and should be carefully guarded price-wise by the Congress and by whatever public agencies are involved. Reducing the price of the public's timber will allow the large timber owner to hoard its own holdings while exploiting the public's holdings.

We note a news story from the Sacramento Bee, Sacramento, Calif., dealing with a sale

in the El Dorado National Forest. The estimated value (appraisal) was \$22,740. The high bid was \$147,460, seven times the appraised value. The next high bid was \$94,856. The amount of timber involved was 14.2 million feet. Obviously a very high sale that led to speculation for stumpage control. To lower the appraisals would only leave more room for speculation and add exploiting to it.

We are also opposed to Mrs. HANSEN'S H.R. 11135, setting up an expensive appeals procedure within the Forest Service. This would allow the larger operators to keep timber sales tied up in appeals procedure at the expense of smaller operators and providing another control over the public's resources by the manufacturing industry.

While we have not noted any reference to ocean shipping in the industry's presentation, we are opposed to any relaxation of regulations requiring American products to be shipped in American bottoms. The industry locally has been trying to get support for shipment in foreign-owned bottoms to avoid the higher costs of wages, etc., of American seamen.

#### THE AMERICAN LUMBER IMPORT PROBLEM

(Prepared by National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C., for the Congressional Conference on American Lumber Industry Problems and Solutions, April 11, 1962)

Briefly, some of the factors which are of serious concern to the forest-based communities dependent upon a prosperous lumber industry for their economic security are:

1. Total U.S. lumber production, at 31.7 billion board feet in 1961, was 4.2 billion board feet below the 13-year average for the period 1949-61.

2. One of the major segments of U.S. lumber production, softwood lumber, at 27.5 billion board feet of production in 1961, was also down nearly 1.8 billion board feet below the 13-year average for this same period, 1949-61.

3. At the same time, softwood lumber imports from Canada were up from 1.4 billion board feet in 1949, to 4 billion board feet in 1961. Canada supplies about 95 percent of the total U.S. imports of lumber. In 1961 alone there was an increase of 400 million board feet in lumber imports from Canada. Canada supplied 5.2 percent of U.S. consumption of softwood lumber in 1949, and in 1961 approximately 14 percent. Lumber imports from Canada are up approximately 186 percent over the past 13 years.

4. As of April 6, 1962, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics advises there are more than 200,000 men and women formerly employed in the lumber and wood products industries now drawing unemployment compensation. This figure does not include unemployment in the retail and wholesale trade. There are approximately 3 million employees in all the 50 States employed in the lumber and wood products industries.

The forest products industries of the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho provide over one-quarter of a million direct jobs, and if related services and community jobs are included, these industries provide over 1 million jobs.

5. According to the Wall Street Journal of April 4, 1962, Canadians are able to capture whatever share of the U.S. market they desire by quoting prices 3 to 8 percent below U.S. producers.

6. Current tariffs between the United States and Canada are as follows:

(a) Most U.S. softwood lumber of the major general construction species bears a rate of 7.5 to 10 percent ad valorem (\$5 to \$7.50 per thousand board feet) when exported to Canada.

(b) On the other hand, most Canadian softwood lumber entering the United States

bears a tariff and tax of from 25 cents to \$1 per thousand board feet.

7. Some of the principal reasons for the sharp increase in Canadian imports are:

(a) Government-pegged lower stumpage costs: The average stumpage costs in British Columbia, 1960, all species, \$5.38; the average stumpage costs in Western United States, 1960, all species, \$20.02; the average stumpage cost in the Pacific Northwest, 1960, all species, \$22.89; the average stumpage costs in the South, 1960, southern pine, \$26.

(b) Government-granted transportation advantages: Because of regional transportation advantages available to Canadian lumber producers, the Canadians are able to ship their products to many U.S. markets at a decided competitive transportation advantage over American producers.

(c) Government-manipulated currency exchange advantages: In 1961, the Canadian Government artificially pegged the Canadian dollar at 95 cents as compared to the U.S. dollar. This single act had the effect of reducing the price to U.S. purchasers of Canadian lumber by 5 percent, or, stated differently, giving to Canadian lumber producers a 5-percent advantage in U.S. markets.

(d) Positive Government assistance in trade mission and other export development activities: Both the provincial and the central government are actively engaged in the promotion of Canadian lumber exports to the United States and other markets. However, they appear to concentrate their efforts with respect to lumber and wood products on exporting to the United States.

#### LUMBER INDUSTRY SOLUTION TO FOREIGN IMPORT PROBLEM

Because of recent sharp increases in the quantity of softwood lumber entering the United States from abroad, mainly softwood lumber from Canada, which can be attributed to specific advantages given to foreign producers by their government, the lumber industry in the United States advocates a six-point program to eliminate these inequities so as to provide equal opportunity for the sale of American lumber in the United States and its provinces.

1. We request that the U.S. Department of Commerce arrange an immediate conference between lumber industry representatives of the United States and Canada to discuss the serious problems created by excessive forest products imports into the United States;

2. The objectives of this meeting should be the removal of existing softwood lumber tariffs between the two nations until such time as imports in either country reach 10 percent of its domestic softwood lumber consumption, after which a 10-percent tariff would be assessed by that country on further imports;

3. We strongly urge that appropriate agencies of the U.S. Government take prompt action to counteract the manipulation of their currency by nations with lumber products competing with the U.S. lumber industry in the U.S. markets;

4. We urge such implementation and extension of the Buy American Act principle as may be necessary to assure that all lumber and wood products used in construction, federally financed and/or federally insured (as in FHA-insured housing), is of domestic manufacture;

5. The possibility of invoking section 22 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act of 1937, to obtain quantitative limitations in the importation of forest products into the United States should be investigated; and

6. Inasmuch as exports are of such great importance to the American lumber economy, a thorough market study should be made with the specific objective of expanding the export of American forest products.

#### THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

On February 21, more than 50 representatives of the Nation's lumber industry met with Secretary of Agriculture Freeman to present to him the lumber industry's recommendations regarding national forest management.

Attending that meeting were 45 Members of Congress and administrative assistants to Members.

The lumber industry's presentation to the Secretary simply requested consideration of four changes in Forest Service administration.

The four proposals pertaining to allowable cut, appraisal methods, appeals procedure, and contract review are set forth below.

These four specific issues have been developing over a long period of time. Many industry groups have been involved in negotiating and refining these issues with the Forest Service for more than 10 years.

The solution of these problems will make a major contribution to community stability and reduce the cost of lumber to the consumer.

There are numerous other Government timber problems which need attention. On these four specific points the entire industry is united in urging immediate action. Their meaning is clear to both the industry and to the Forest Service. They are capable of prompt administrative action.

It has been 7 weeks since the lumber industry presented these proposals to the Secretary. No word has been received from the Department of Agriculture on this matter, although numerous Members of Congress have requested action.

Some word should soon be forthcoming.

#### PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Proposal No. 1 would set forth the objective of national forest timber management as providing for a high degree of productivity with due regard for stability of dependent communities, continuity of employment and a healthy wood-products industry. These were important objectives of the Forest Service for many years following Secretary of Agriculture Wilson's famous directive of 1905 which also referred to the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run. The proposed new regulation would establish standards of performance for national forest management. It would require an annual report in the nature of an accounting which could be used to appraise the productivity of the national forests.

#### TIMBER APPRAISALS

The second proposed regulation deals with timber appraisal practices and is intended to allow the Forest Service to sell Government timber without taking advantage of its monopoly position where there are no alternative sources of timber supply. A monopoly proprietor, whether a private entity or the Federal Government is in a position to exact artificially high prices for his products. Federal administrators responsible for management of public timber and the General Accounting Office must recognize that in this monopoly position the Federal Government has a life or death power over dependent purchasers and communities. There is a real need for a regulation to guide the administrators to preclude their taking advantage of the Government's monopoly position. The regulation proposed by the industry would provide that appraised prices be based on average costs of production and of average selling prices of products rather than on bid prices which may be unrealistically high due to lack of an alternative source of supply, failure to offer the full allowable cut, excessive mill capacity or speculation as to future values. The proposal would require that the lumber prices

used in arriving at appraised prices be based on current markets rather than speculative forecasts. It would require that profit allowances be based on averages for competing industries. Costs of logging, manufacturing, and selling should be based on industry averages as related to local sale conditions.

#### APPEALS PROCEDURE

The third proposal is a request for a new appeals procedure. It proposes a prompt and impartial procedure for resolving contract and contract administration and performance differences. The U.S. Forest Service in its management of the national forests is not subject to the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act. The present appeals procedure is slow and expensive, and the final decision remains with the seller, the Federal agency.

#### CONTRACT REVISION

The fourth proposal is a request for a complete revision of the timber sale contract form in order to establish a normal buyer-and-seller relationship between the Forest Service and the industry. At the present time, the contract form permits a one-sided relationship by reason of an excessive amount of power and control in the hands of the seller, permitting arbitrary, unilateral seller domination of the buyer-and-seller relationship.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SHIPMENT OF RICE BY RED CHINA TO CUBA

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would not wish to let this opportunity pass without making a comment on an item which appears in the morning press, which states that Red China has delivered to Mr. Castro in Cuba 24 million pounds of rice, which is said to have arrived at Cienfuegos yesterday. This is a shocking report in view of millions of starving Red Chinese.

In this great Nation we are concerned about starving Chinese people, and sincerely so concerned. We are sympathetic with them in their hunger, difficulties, and problems. Yet I would feel it a neglect of my duty if I did not express my sincere regret upon learning that the Red Chinese are shipping 24 million pounds of rice to Castro in Cuba at a time when millions of their own people are starving. I think our Nation should take note of that as we begin to talk about sending food into Red China. This action proves that the Red dictatorship has no compassion for their hungering and suffering people.

#### SEATRAN SERVICE TO ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the other day the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner editorially pointed out:

An important new chapter in Alaska's development history was quietly marked last Friday morning at Whittier, when railroad

freight cars loaded in Canada and the smaller States rolled onto Alaska Railroad tracks, to be unloaded at Anchorage, Clear, and Fairbanks.

The editorial, which appeared in America's farthest north daily May 21, explains what this service is and what it can mean in the developing economy of Alaska. The editorial goes on to state:

With inauguration of Canadian National Railways' new "Aqua-train service," all manner of consumer goods and commercial items for interior Alaska can now be loaded into railroad cars at any rail point in the smaller States or Canada, and not touched again until the car doors are opened for unloading at the warehouse door in Fairbanks.

We can now eliminate the costly handling and rehandling of Alaska-bound freight in Seattle—unnecessary labor which Alaskans have been paying for with every purchase for more than half a century.

Up until now "one-car through freight service" (with consequent lower freight charges) simply has not existed for Alaskans. Virtually every item purchased by Alaskans—groceries, clothing, automobiles, machinery, etc.—has been loaded into railroad cars at point of manufacture and shipped to Seattle.

In the Puget Sound city Alaska-bound freight is unloaded, moved into a warehouse or storage area, moved back out and carted to the dock, loaded aboard ship, unloaded off the ship into a warehouse or storage area, loaded again onto trucks or the Alaska Railroad—and, finally, unloaded once again at a warehouse in Fairbanks, Anchorage, or other railbelt destination.

Accompanying all this costly shuffling, handling and rehandling was another costly unnecessary shuffle: Man-hours involved in the mountains of paperwork necessary to keep track of the origin, present whereabouts, and final destination of each item of freight—plus all the bookkeeping necessary to separate all the charges of the several carriers involved.

Alaska's transportation has for many years been caught in the middle of the "chicken or egg first" problem: Development has been stymied because freight rates and cost of living were too high; cost of living and freight rates were too high because of lack of sufficient volume and lack of a south-bound freight haul which comes with development.

It's a vicious cycle.

The CNR "Aqua-train" is the opening wedge to break this transportation-development logarithm.

The Canadian National Railways operation involves running railroad cars onto barges at Prince Rupert, B.C., and unloading the cars at the Alaska Railroad terminal at Whittier. Routing via Prince Rupert shortens the distance from Midwest and Eastern manufacturing centers to railbelt Alaska from 600 to 800 miles.

The shorter distance, plus substantial savings accruing from elimination of unnecessary handling en route, gives CNR a substantial and distinct cost advantage over Seattle, traditional freight gateway to Alaska.

The Canadian National-Alaska Railroad recently published freight rates offer substantial savings to Alaska consumers in the comparatively heavily populated railbelt—savings which we are sure Alaskans are going to be quick to grasp.

Unless Seattle and American railroads serving the Pacific Northwest promptly modernize present antiquated Alaska freight handling methods, the traditional freight traffic pattern from the smaller States to Alaska is going to swing north. Prince Rupert will largely replace Seattle as the "Alaska Gateway City" within a very few years.

Alaskans have many friends in Seattle, and vice versa. There is not going to be any overnight change in source of supply to Alaskans. Habit and close Seattle-Alaska business affiliations extending over many years past are factors which will preclude any dramatic, abrupt departure from the Alaska custom of trading with and through Seattle.

But the change will come. In fact, it has already started. Prince Rupert is in business as an Alaska gateway city, and that designation will be permanent. Inauguration of the Alaska State ferry system operation next year, connecting Prince Rupert with all principal southeastern Alaskan communities, will add impetus to Prince Rupert's role as an Alaskan gateway.

Increasing development is bringing increasing competition among Alaska businesses. Competition forces the most economical supply sources, and the most efficient transportation routings. Prince Rupert has logistical and economical advantages over Seattle—advantages which must be utilized by the Alaskan businessman who must at least stay abreast of competitors to survive.

Whether Prince Rupert 5 years from now is known as "An Alaskan Gateway City" or as "The Alaskan Gateway City" is largely dependent upon whether Seattle finds efficient methods to be competitive. We hope Seattle does.

Aside from sentimental reasons it is to Alaska's advantage to have competitive supply sources and competitive shipping methods and routes. Competition is the heart of the American free enterprise system which has developed the 49 smaller States and which will develop our resource-rich Alaska.

Regardless of what the future brings in competition between Alaska gateway cities, May 18, 1962—"CNR Aquatrain Day"—will be an important date when Alaska's development history is written.

A hearty and sincere "well done and thank you" is in order from Alaskans to the foresighted railway executives who put new "Aqua-train" service into operation. Special bouquets are merited for G. R. Graham, CNR vice president, former ARR General Manager Donald J. Smith, and present ARR General Manager John Manley.

A few years from now we will be able to look back and clearly see the transportation barrier to Alaska's development was breached in 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2996) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2996) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

**BIPARTISAN EFFORT FOR FINAL SETTLEMENT OF AMERICAN WAR CLAIMS PROBLEM ANNOUNCED—COMPREHENSIVE AMENDMENTS PRESENTED**

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Congress has done a grave injustice to tens of thousands of American war claimants by failing for 17 years to authorize payment for losses they suffered during World War II. After much controversy and delay, an inadequate filing bill was reported to the Senate last September and is now on the Senate Calendar.

This bill has languished on the Senate Calendar much too long. It should be called up promptly, appropriately amended, and speedily enacted. No one Senator should have the right to veto consideration of this measure because of his opposition to either the bill or our proposed amendments.

The funds for payment of American war losses are available. An agency for processing such claims—the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—is in existence. The missing ingredient for final action is legislation authorizing the filing and payment of claims. Everything possible must be done to prod essential legislative action at this session of Congress.

The American war claims bill (S. 2618) which has been on the Senate Calendar for many months, should be scheduled for action promptly. The chances for adoption of the amendments we are today proposing to this bill are very good. Approval of this legislation with these amendments would bring us close to a final solution of the war claims problem and would be a significant accomplishment for this Congress.

There has been a great deal said recently about the obligations of the United States to pay the balance of funds for Philippine war claims. During the morning hour today, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a communication relative to the Philippine bill, with an accompanying resolution of the House of Representatives of the Republic of the Philippines. I am very sympathetic to this program and would support any reasonable legislation to redeem our pledges to the people of the Philippines.

But what of the Americans who have been waiting 17 years for payment of their claims? More should be said and done about this problem. It is time someone spoke up as eloquently and forcefully for our own citizens as for our friends in other parts of the world.

The American war claims bill deserves a high priority in our deliberations. I am confident that if given the opportunity, an overwhelming majority of the Congress would support the kind of legislation which is needed and would redeem our commitments to our fellow citizens.

A brief summary of the amendments to S. 2618 which we believe are needed follows:

First. An amendment to restore the provisions for payment of adjudicated claims rather than their mere filing as provided in the pending bill. There is no justification at this date for deferring payment of legitimate claims. Both this

administration and the prior administration strongly urged payment of the war claims out of the proceeds of the former enemy assets vested during World War II. A House subcommittee has recommended a war claims bill with payment provisions, and the full House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is expected to recommend this measure to the House in the near future. Favorable House action is anticipated in the near future, and the Senate should follow the same course. This same amendment will also allow fair compensation to be paid Americans who suffered losses in Hungary. The administration has supported inclusion of these claims on a proportionate basis because of the inadequacy of the Hungarian Claims Fund to pay more than 1 percent of prior awards. This amendment is cosponsored by Senators HART, JAVITS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, SCOTT, and myself.

Second. An amendment to permit the sale of vested assets despite the pendency of interminable litigation as to the ownership. The principal asset this would affect is the General Aniline and Film Corp., which is still being run by the Government. The amendment would fully protect the rights of the litigants to just compensation in the doubtful event they ultimately prevail in the lawsuit. In the interim, however, this huge enterprise could be freed from the dead hand of Government control and allowed to develop to its full potential under free enterprise. This amendment also has had the strong backing of both administrations, as well as the endorsement of labor unions, business groups, veterans organizations, and many civic organizations. It is cosponsored by Senators HART, CASE of New Jersey, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, JAVITS, SCOTT, and myself.

Third. An amendment to permit the lump sum settlement in the amount of \$500,000 of so-called heirless property claims. This money would be used entirely to aid in the rehabilitation and settlement of persons in the United States who suffered from persecution during the Nazi regime. It represents only a fraction of the estimated assets belonging to persecutees which our Government vested and was unable to return after World War II because of the death without heirs of the beneficiaries. This is a most humanitarian measure. It has the support in principle of both administrations, and the Bureau of the Budget has specifically approved the \$500,000 amount provided in our amendment. This amendment is cosponsored by Senators HART, JAVITS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, SCOTT, and myself.

Fourth. The final amendment would include under the bill all persons who are nationals of the United States on the date of the bill's enactment. Without such a provision, the bill would discriminate against Americans on the basis of the length of their citizenship and leave later nationals without any remedy for the losses they suffered during World War II. We have never sanctioned any concept of second-class or junior citizenship in the law, and no precedent for

such unequal treatment of Americans should be permitted under this program. It may be that a system of priorities would be justified, but in any case we must insist upon fair treatment of all our citizens under whatever war claims bill is enacted. This amendment is cosponsored by Senators HART, JAVITS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, SCOTT, and myself.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senators designated, I send my amendments to the desk and ask unanimous consent that they be printed and ordered to lie on the table.

I also ask unanimous consent that the texts of the amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 8, line 15, amend section 204 to read as follows:

"No claim shall be allowed under subsections (a), (b), (c), (e), and (f) of section 202 of this title unless (1) the claimant and all predecessors in interest in the claim were, on the date of loss, damage, destruction, or removal and continuously thereafter until the date of filing claim with the Commission pursuant to this title, nationals of the United States, including any person, who having lost United States citizenship solely by reason of marriage to a citizen or subject of a foreign country, reacquired such citizenship prior to the date of enactment of this title if such individual, but for such marriage, would have been a national of the United States at all times on and after the date of such loss, damage, destruction, or removal until the filing of his claim; or (2) in the case of an individual who personally suffered the loss, damage, destruction, or removal for which the claim is filed is a national of the United States on the date of enactment of this title."

At the appropriate place add a new section as follows:

**"SALES OF VESTED ASSETS IN LITIGATION**

"Sec. —. Section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided further, That upon a determination made by the President, in time of war or during any national emergency declared by the President, that the interest and welfare of the United States require the sale of any property or interest or any part thereof claimed in any suit filed under this subsection and pending on or after the date of enactment of this proviso the Alien Property Custodian or any successor officer or agency may sell such property or interest or part thereof, in conformity with law applicable to sales of property by him, at any time prior to the entry of final judgment in such suit. No such sale shall be made until thirty days have passed after the publication of notice in the Federal Register of the intention to sell. The net proceeds of any such sale shall be deposited in a special account established in the Treasury, and shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Treasury pending the entry of final judgment in such suit. Any recovery of any claimant in such suit in respect of the property or interest or part thereof so sold shall be satisfied from the net proceeds of such sale unless such claimant, within sixty days after receipt of the notice of the amount of net proceeds of sale serves upon the Alien Property Custodian, or any successor officer or agency, and files with the court an election to waive all claims to the net proceeds,

or any part thereof, and to claim just compensation instead. If the court finds that the claimant has established an interest, right, or title in any property in respect of which such an election has been served and filed, it shall proceed to determine the amount which will constitute just compensation for such interest, right, or title, and shall order payment to the claimant of the amount so determined. An order for the payment of just compensation hereunder shall be a judgment against the United States and shall be payable first from the net proceeds of the sale in an amount not to exceed the amount the claimant would have received had he elected to accept his proportionate part of the net proceeds of the sale, and the balance, if any, shall be payable in the same manner as are judgments in cases arising under section 1346 of title 28, United States Code. The Alien Property Custodian or any successor officer or agency, shall immediately upon the entry of final judgment, notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the determination by final judgment of the claimant's interest and right to the proportionate part of the net proceeds from the sale, and the final determination by judgment of the amount of just compensation in the event the claimant has elected to recover just compensation for the interest in the property he claimed."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses, and to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended."

On page 11, line 5, insert prior to the period the following: "except any claimant whose award under section 303(1) of title III of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, is recertified pursuant to subsection (b) of section 209 of this title."

Section 2: On page 11, line 7, designate the present text of section 209 with the subsection symbol "(a)" and add at the end thereof a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) The Commission shall recertify to the Secretary of the Treasury, in terms of United States currency, for payment out of the War Claims Fund, awards heretofore made against the Government of Hungary under section 303(1) of title III of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed as authorizing the filing of new claims against Hungary."

Section 3: On page 12, line 7, amend section 213 to read as follows:

"Sec. 213. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay out of the War Claims Fund on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to this title as follows and in the following order of priority:

"(1) Payment in full of awards made pursuant to section 202(d) (1) and (2).

"(2) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the other awards made pursuant to section 202 in an amount which shall be the same for each award or in the amount of the award, whichever is less. The total payment made pursuant to this paragraph on account of any award shall not exceed \$10,000.

"(3) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid balance of each remaining award made pursuant to section 202 or recertified pursuant to subsection (b) of section 209 which shall bear to such unpaid balance the same proportion as the total amount in the War Claims Fund and available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid balances of all such awards. Payments heretofore made under section 310 of title III of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, on awards made against the Government of Hungary under section 303(1) of title III of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949,

as amended, and recertified under subsection (b) of section 209, shall be considered as payments under this paragraph and no payment shall be made on any recertified award until the percentage of distribution on awards made under section 202 exceeds the corresponding percentage of distribution on such recertified award: *Provided*, That no payment made on awards recertified under subsection (b) of section 209 shall exceed 40 per centum of the amount of the award recertified.

"(b) Such payments, and applications for such payments, shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

"(c) For the purpose of making any such payments, other than under section 213 (a) (1), an 'award' shall be deemed to mean the aggregate of all awards certified for payment in favor of the same claimant.

"(d) If any person to whom any payment is to be made pursuant to this title is deceased or is under a legal disability, payment shall be made to his legal representative, except that if any payment to be made is not over \$1,000 and there is no qualified executor or administrator, payment may be made to the person or persons found by the Comptroller General to be entitled thereto, without the necessity of compliance with the requirements of law with respect to the administration of estates.

"(e) Payment on account of any award pursuant to this title shall not, unless such payment is for the full amount of the award, extinguish any rights against any foreign government for the unpaid balance of the award.

"(f) Payments made under this section on account of any award for loss, damage, or destruction occurring in the Commonwealth of the Philippines shall not exceed the amount paid on account of awards in the same amount under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

Section 4: On page 15, line 19, amend section 4 to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. Section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cover into the Treasury from time to time for deposit in the War Claims Fund such sums from property vested in him or transferred to him under this Act as he shall determine in his discretion not to be required to fulfill obligations imposed under this Act or any other provision of law, and not to be the subject matter of any judicial action or proceeding. There shall be deducted from each such deposit 5 per centum thereof for expenses incurred by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and by the Treasury Department in the administration of title II of the War Claims Act of 1948. Such deductions shall be made before any payment is made pursuant to such title. All amounts so deducted shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

At the appropriate place insert a new section as follows:

"SETTLEMENT OF HEIRLESS PROPERTY CLAIMS

"Sec. —. (a) Section 32(h) of the Trading With the Enemy Act is amended by striking out all that follows the first sentence in the first paragraph down through the third paragraph, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'In the case of any organization not so designated before the date of enactment of this amendment, such organization may be so designated only if it applies for such designation within three months after such date of enactment.'

"The President, or such officer as he may designate, shall, before the expiration of the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this amendment, pay out

of the War Claims Fund to organizations designated before or after the date of enactment of this amendment pursuant to this subsection the sum of \$500,000. If there is more than one such designated organization, such sum shall be allocated among such organizations in the proportions in which the proceeds of heirless property were distributed, pursuant to agreements to which the United States was a party, by the Intergovernmental Committee for Refugees and successor organizations thereto. Acceptance of payment pursuant to this subsection by any such organization shall constitute a full and complete discharge of all claims filed by such organization pursuant to this section, as it existed before the date of enactment of this amendment.

"No payment may be made to any organization designated under this section unless it has given firm and responsible assurances approved by the President that (1) the payment will be used on the basis of need in the rehabilitation and settlement of persons in the United States who suffered substantial deprivation of liberty or failed to enjoy the full rights of citizenship within the meaning of subdivisions (C) and (D) of subsection (a)(2) of this section; (2) it will make to the President, with a copy to be furnished to the Congress, such reports (including a detailed annual report on the use of the payment made to it) and permit such examination of its books as the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, may from time to time require; and (3) it will not use any part of such payment for legal fees, salaries, or other administrative expenses connected with the filing of claims for such payment or for the recovery of any property or interest under this section."

"(b) The first sentence of section 33 of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows 'whichever is later' and inserting a period.

"(c) Section 39 of such Act is amended by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following new sentence: 'Immediately upon the enactment of this amendment, the Attorney General shall cover into the Treasury of the United States, for deposit into the War Claims Fund, from property vested in or transferred to him under this Act, the sum of \$500,000 to make payments authorized under section 32(h) of this Act.'

#### REEMPLOYMENT OF JERRY JACKIS BY AID

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on April 1 of this year an excellent article regarding a case in the Department of State Agency for International Development involving one Mr. Jackis, written by the distinguished reporter Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, was published in the Des Moines Register. Mr. Mollenhoff's article indicated that Mr. Jackis had been fired after having done what appeared to be an outstanding job as an auditor for the Agency of the International Development in Korea and Southeast Asia.

I suggested that possibly some unfavorable and unfair treatment had been accorded Mr. Jackis by his supervisors. On April 10, I addressed a letter to Mr. Fowler Hamilton, Director for the Agency for International Development, requesting that he review the details of the case, furnish me a statement of the facts, and also review the case with a view to determining whether or not some of Mr. Jackis' supervisors should be disciplined.

On May 3 I again wrote to Mr. Hamilton requesting a reply to my letter of

April 10. On May 11 I received a letter from Mr. John Salter, Director of the Congressional Liaison Staff, on behalf of Mr. Hamilton, indicating that a review of the facts would be undertaken.

I note with favor that Mr. Jackis was rehired by the Agency for International Development last Monday, and although his new job is not that of auditor, I understand that it is one that is quite acceptable to him as an administrative assistant handling insurance for foreign participants in the AID program.

There is only one remaining item to be ascertained, and that is whether or not any of Mr. Jackis' supervisors abused their positions and took unfair advantage of this faithful Government employee. I have been advised that a review of the record will be undertaken and is being undertaken to determine whether or not any of Mr. Jackis' supervisors should in fact be disciplined.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Mollenhoff to which I referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**HOW VIGILANT U.S. EMPLOYEE LOST HIS JOB—  
BOSSSES BIASED, FILE JUGGLED, HE SAYS  
(By Clark Mollenhoff)**

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In Korea, Jerry Jackis searched out and exposed a multimillion-dollar scandal in the use of American foreign aid.

In the jungles of northern Cambodia, he rode an elephant and hiked with a small group of soldiers to determine the effectiveness of the U.S. program for digging wells, to cutdown on waterborne disease.

When he noticed that U.S.-financed concrete, asphalt and reinforcement rods were going into a Russian-sponsored hospital in Phnom-Penh, Cambodia, he reported it.

In many ways it would seem that 41-year-old Jackis would be just the man that the International Development Agency (AID) would want to help straighten out the foreign aid program.

**LOSES JOB**

But last week Jackis was out of a job, and was knocking on doors at other Government agencies trying to find another before the \$30-a-week unemployment checks stopped.

In January, Jackis was dropped from his \$8,700-a-year job in the AID Agency on the basis of a file that showed he was given a "one" (low) efficiency rating in 1958, the month after he insisted on reporting the U.S.-financed material was being used on a Soviet showpiece, the Russian-sponsored hospital.

An investigation by a House Government Operations Subcommittee has established no justification for the low efficiency rating in 1958.

But the big AID Agency just can't find a place for him, and obviously isn't trying very hard. Some high employees of AID say that in some respects it is a favor to Jackis to refuse to rehire him, for he probably wouldn't be very happy working with AID employees after taking his troubles to a congressional committee.

**WHY HE FIGHTS**

Jackis is enough of a realist to know that he would be resented by some officials, for his testimony has indicated weaknesses in the aid program and laxness and incompetency in administration of it. But he wants to be rehired as a foreign aid investigator to vindicate him in his 3-year fight to get a public hearing.

Vindication is more than just a moral victory, for unless he is rehired by the foreign aid agency his discharge will be a permanent hurdle to clear in seeking any other Government post.

Chairman PORTER HARDY, Democrat, of Virginia, and Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, key members of the House Investigating Subcommittee, have indicated they feel Jackis has been the victim of a vicious conspiracy within the bureaucracy of the foreign aid program.

**WANTS NEW STUDY**

Jackis is hopeful that the committee will force Aid Administrator Fowler Hamilton to make another examination of the case and disregard the unflattering opinions and conclusions with which his superiors filled his file in the months after he reported the U.S. aid being used on the Soviet-sponsored hospital.

At this stage no one has attributed any subversive motives to the officials in AID who downgraded Jackis. Chairman HARDY has indicated he believes it is a combination of vindictiveness and bureaucratic bungling.

**IN FOREIGN AID JOB SINCE 1954**

Jackis, son of a Greek immigrant barber, was born in Savannah, Ga., and was reared in Charleston, S.C. He was a wry 5 foot 8 and weighed 135 pounds, and played high school football.

In 1942, after 2 years at The Citadel, he volunteered for the Army, and served with Patton's 3d Army in France and Germany.

After his discharge from service in 1946, he went to work as a clerk at the General Accounting Office and started to save money to return to college.

In 1948 he went back to the Citadel and in 1950 was graduated with a bachelor's degree in English. He worked as a civilian employee in Marine Corps Headquarters, transferred to the National Security Agency, before taking 6 months out for travel and study in Greece.

**SENT TO KOREA**

In 1954 Jackis was hired by the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA), the Agency that handled foreign aid at that time. It later became the International Cooperation Administration, and was changed to AID last year.

Jackis was one of the first end-use investigators sent to Korea. The job was to trace down how foreign aid was used, and determine if the final use was in line with the law, policy and goals of the United States.

The Jackis career was sensational. The multimillion-dollar scandals he uncovered in Korea came to the attention of the highest officials there and in Washington. He was given a two-grade promotion in July 1956, on the basis of his initiative and performance.

His accomplishments were listed as exposure of one \$750,000 fraud, and uncovering of a million-dollar scandal.

**NEAR THE TOP**

"The result of his initial findings will be the correction of abuses now inherent in the procurement and supply of ICA material," the report stated. His rating was now four which is next to the perfect five rating.

Within a year, Jackis completed his tour of duty in Korea, took his home leave, and in March 1957, was assigned to Cambodia. In his first months in Cambodia, Jackis received ratings of three or four, and in the spring of 1958 he was commended for a comprehensive report on the status of the overall foreign aid program in Cambodia.

**U.S. ASPHALT IN SOVIET JOB**

On June 10, 1958, Jackis was returning from work when he noted the Russian-sponsored hospital had ICA-purchased cement

in the yard to be used on the still uncompleted structure.

He looked closer, and noted that asphalt drums in the yard appeared to have the ICA symbol painted out, and there were steel reinforcement rods of a type purchased by ICA.

When he filed his report, Jackis says, he hoped to follow up with a more complete investigation. Instead, he said, he was "chewed out" by Marlin Haas, the supervisor. He said Haas told him he had no business investigating the material used in the Russian hospital.

Jackis told the Hardy committee he felt he had an obligation to investigate and report any indications of misuse of foreign aid.

**PROBE OF WELLS**

Within a few days after this incident, Jackis said, Paul Beroud, his immediate supervisor, and Haas assigned him to an investigation of the wells in the remote parts of Cambodia. These dozens of wells were constructed with ICA funds, and supposedly according to U.S. specification.

Jackis said he went into the jungle on a half dozen expeditions to examine the wells, accompanied by a French mission employee, and by a small group of soldiers in the more remote sections. There were no trains to many of the places, and they rode bicycles, rode an elephant, or walked.

"We finally found all of the wells," Jackis said. His reports on the wells showed that many were not properly constructed, that a large number were dry, and that in almost all cases the pump was broken, or had been pulled up and discarded.

There were no ICA signs on the few wells that were in place. Jackis made a factual report and suggested that something should be done.

**DISAGREED**

Back at the Cambodian capital, Jackis said, Haas and Beroud questioned his facts.

"They had not been outside of the capital at that time, and yet they argued with the facts in my report which included the precise location of the wells," Jackis said. "They argued that I had not found the right wells, and I insisted that I had and that the reports were correct."

Jackis declared that a later investigation in 1960 by other aid officials confirmed his report.

"But that did me no good at that time," Jackis said. "They continued to fill my file with complaints about my work."

**SWEPT FLOORS LIKE A COOLIE**

In August 1958, Jackis filed an appeal from the low rating that Beroud and Haas had submitted. In the meantime, Jackis said he was taken off end-use investigations and was assigned to a warehouse where he had to straighten the warehouse and "like a coolie" do such jobs as moving furniture and sweeping floors.

"I did it, because I was sure that it would be all over when my appeal was read in Washington," Jackis said.

However, when Jackis finally got to Washington in the summer of 1959, he found that no action had been taken on his appeal. In fact, those he questioned couldn't find it.

When it was finally found, Jackis was informed that no appeal procedure was set up in what was then the ICA. Everyone seemed at a loss as to what to do about the appeal.

**TOLD HE WON**

It wasn't until October 10, 1960, that Jackis received any satisfaction from J. T. Walden, acting director of personnel.

Walden notified Jackis that "the derogatory implication of the efficiency rating mention has been overcome by subsequent documentation."

"No further action on the appeal will be taken by the Agency," Walden wrote to

Jackis. "Future assignments, as for all satisfactory employees, will depend on positions available, and the qualifications of persons eligible to be considered therefor."

In his Washington work, Jackis was receiving "three" and "four" ratings, but that somehow didn't get him another assignment.

#### FIRED ON BASIS OF STRIPPED FILE

Last November, Jackis received notice that he would be terminated in January. It was a polite notice that he was being fired, and the hurrying newly named AID didn't take time to interview Jackis.

Jackis was unsuccessful in seeking to gain access to that file for months. When he finally examined it in the last 3 weeks, he found it was stripped of most of the pertinent documents on his side of the dispute.

However, there was no lack of documentary evidence against Jackis. "The efficiency rating of one that Mr. Hass had given me, which is well documented, is in the file," he said.

#### CLEARANCE MISSING

Also eliminated from the file were the records showing that the 1960 investigation had actually cleared Jackis of the charges in connection with the reports on the wells, and had found the "one" rating to be unsubstantiated.

"I'm no security risk. I don't have any criminal record. All I did was do my job, and I just didn't think that it was possible for this to happen to anyone unless you did something wrong," Jackis said.

Jackis said he felt fortunate that he is not a married man with the financial responsibility for children.

"I'm a bachelor, and I have saved up a little money so I can get along for a time," Jackis said.

#### THE DECLINING FARM POPULATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the May 29 issue of the Des Moines Register there is an excellent lead editorial on the subject of the declining farm population.

The writer of this editorial makes the point that we spend a great amount of time talking about the urgent need for farm adjustment, whereas the greater need is for adjustment of the rest of society to the adjustment that has already occurred in farming.

How true that point is. The census of agriculture made in 1960 shows that for the year 1959, 22 percent of the farmers produced 72 percent of the farm products sold, and 39 percent produced 87 percent of the farm products sold. This means that 61 percent of the Nation's farmers produced only 13 percent of the farm products sold in 1959. I suggest that there is nothing to indicate that the situation has become any better with respect to those people. While it is recognized that many of these farmers in the 61-percent category are only part-time farmers, it is obvious that many of these people could not expect to make a decent living for themselves and their families. And so we have been witnessing a great exodus of farmers and their families from the rural areas in the last several years.

Within the last year 832,000 people have moved off the farms. The figures from the Department of Agriculture show that in 1960, 15,635,000 people lived on farms. In 1961 the number had declined to 14,803,000. What are those people going to do when they move off the farms? What are they going to do if we have a serious unemployment

situation among those who are already living in the cities and towns? That is the big problem. If we are able to take care of the unemployment problem, there would be room for the farmers and their families to find useful occupations when they move off the farms, but unfortunately the situation is that we have a critical unemployment problem. That is the point of the Des Moines Register article.

Before we complain too much of the situation as far as our farmers are concerned, I think we had better look further at the whole of society and try to work out some solution to the serious unemployment problem to relieve the aggravation that is occurring when farmers do move off the farms, because they cannot make a go of it on their farms.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the Des Moines Register be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### VANISHING FARMERS

The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that the number of people living on farms in the United States dropped to 14,803,000 in 1961.

That is a somewhat smaller number of people living on farms in the whole United States than live in the metropolitan area of New York City.

It is less than one of every 12 persons in the total population.

It is probably the smallest farm population in the United States since 1880.

The number of people living on farms has been recorded separately by the census only since 1910. (Before that it was included in "rural" with the number in towns below 2,500.) In that year, the total was 32 million, probably about the high point of U.S. farm population. The number declined slightly during the next two decades, then leveled off and even rose a bit during the great depression of the 1930's.

Since World War II, the drop in farm population has speeded up fantastically. The Department of Agriculture estimates that in the one year from 1960 to 1961 the number of farm people shrank by about 830,000.

The figure of 14.8 million people living on farms is based on a very liberal definition of a farm. It includes all places with 10 or more acres of farmland and \$50 or more of farm products sold per year. An even smaller acreage can qualify as a farm if \$250 worth of products are sold.

The farm population has been cut in half in the last 20 years and gives every evidence of continuing to fall for some years ahead. But the absolute decline in numbers certainly will be slower from now on.

Those opponents of Federal farm subsidies who say that the Government has been supporting an intolerably large farm population and providing incentives for people to stay on the farm should look twice at the upheaval which has occurred in two decades. Then they should ask themselves whether a more rapid rate of change would have been possible or digestible.

Since 1940, the total population has grown by more than 50 million, while the farm population has shrunk by 15 million.

The reason, of course, is the amazing technological revolution in agriculture, brought on by publicly sponsored research and education. This has caused labor requirements in farming to go down and down—from 11 million farm workers in 1940 to 7 million

now. Despite farm subsidies, there is no featherbedding in agriculture which seems to have much effect. The process is continuing. Proved labor-saving technology already available is a long way from being fully applied, and new research is scouring out additional improvements for the more distant future.

We spend much time talking about the urgent need for farm adjustment. But the bigger need, obviously, is for adjustment of the rest of society to the adjustment that has already occurred in farming.

State governments, rural towns, businesses related to agriculture, schools, roads—all these are compelled to change because of the violent change in farming.

Iowa, one of the most profoundly affected States, still has far to go to recognize the urbanized (and urbanizing) character of its environment.

Logical arguments can be made for slowing the pace of farm adjustment in the years ahead—but there can be no recovery of the past. Our farm and nonfarm institutions must face up to the change in agriculture which has already taken place if they are to serve the needs of the people in the years ahead.

#### GROWTH IN POWER OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCHES OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on May 14 the Honorable JAMES E. BROMWELL, of the Second Congressional District of Iowa, delivered an outstanding address at the annual teachers' appreciation dinner of the Johnson School Parent-Teachers Association in Cedar Rapids. The keynote of Congressman BROMWELL's address is his concern—a concern being shared by an increasing number of Members of Congress, political writers, and American citizens—over the growth in power of the executive branch of the Federal Government. As he so well put it, the question has been raised whether the written law, Congress, the courts, and the American people will longer restrain the power of the Presidency; and unless citizens act by public opinion and the franchise we shall continue to surrender rights to the Government, uncheck and unbalance the powers, and grant power to the Presidency until we shall have reverted to despotism.

Representative BROMWELL made it very clear that he was speaking of the Presidency—the executive branch of the Government—and not of any particular occupant of the office. His point was made with respect to the office, regardless of who the occupant is.

I believe it would be most enlightening for everyone to read this timely address, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES E. BROMWELL, AT ANNUAL TEACHERS' APPRECIATION DINNER, JOHNSON SCHOOL PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATION, CEDAR RAPIDS, MAY 14, 1962

I must tell you at the outset that I intend to speak very seriously tonight, more seriously, maybe, than a gathering of neighbors might seem to require. We are here, however, because of a common interest in our children and when they are involved, middle ground fades from the range of subject matter. We either visit in warm detail, or we

talk very soberly indeed. Their future is so important, and so long, perhaps light-years long.

I have been reading "The Coming Fury," the splendid first volume of the centennial history of the Civil War which Bruce Catton has written. It opens on the Democratic Convention of 1860 at Charleston—some days, weeks, or years too late. The most persistent impression one carries from the book is this: long before Sumter was fired upon events had passed beyond the control of the ablest persons then living. Chattel slavery, sometime before, had ceased to be an issue between men, between North and South, between owners and nonowners, and had become a matter between God and all the American people. Some would merely survive it—some like Mr. Lincoln writing to Mrs. Bixby would see it clearly as a violent atonement for monstrous evil. None, not even Lincoln, could control it, and he tried.

Some historian may someday name the month of the year in which things got out of hand; someone bolder may do better and tell us the early symptoms of a breakdown in popular control of our national affairs. So far he or she has not been generally recognized and proven sound, and until these things happen we shall feed on fear.

It has happened more than once since Sumter, and it can happen again. A chain of events begins, effect follows cause with acceleration, the point of no return is passed, the tide becomes irreversible, then unchangeable and we come to a time of troubles in which even the best of us can only make the best of it.

We shall feed on fears and we are feeding on them this May. The progressive development of weaponry and technology applied to outer space make them particularly acute in international relations. But the very acuteness of our fears, like pain in a tooth, is hopeful because it has demanded action. No matter how we despair at the headlines, America is making its best effort in this area. Enormously over half the treasure spent on National Government goes into it. In our weapons we have raw force. In our system of foreign trade we have economic strength. In the principles of the Constitution we have moral force. In our programs of foreign aid we have a blend of the latter two with the added recommendations of altruism. In the Disarmament Agency, the Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, we have new ideas. In space research we have a vigorous search for incredible new developments which will certainly bear on future events. Most importantly, with its very soul, the American people have willed peace with justice. Expression is lively. I for one am convinced that every action which would be supported by a consensus of reasonable Americans is being taken or formulated. Criticize any portion of this effort as harshly as you wish (and I personally believe that such criticism is owing for the good of us all), America's presently asserted world leadership belies the real fear that the forces of international anarchy are beyond control.

At least in tonight's frame of reference I am willing to set it aside because of another matter currently most serious in which instruments of control are at hand. We have hurled our strength against the winds of chaos and war; in this other matter we have done nothing and said pitifully little. And herein, of course, lies the danger of losing control and being swept away by events.

I am speaking of the deadly growth of power in the executive arm of the Federal Government and in particular of power in the Presidency.

Note that I refer to the Presidency, not the President. One is an office; the other is a man. This is of the absolute essence of what I have to say. The Presidency is a center of power over us created by laws of our own making or acceptance, a complex

of constitutional and statutory functions; a President is a creature like you and me who is born, suffers, procreates and dies, and when he itches, scratches. The President here is to the Presidency as the Queen in England is to the Crown.

I am not of the President's party nor of the executive branch. I was of the party of the former President but not of the Government at all. This has precious little to do with anything of real importance because long after our generation, you and the President and I, are gone, and the children who have brought us here tonight are facing the problems of their times, the Presidency and the Congress and the freedoms of all the people will remain if—and it is a poignant if—we have been good stewards now.

No violence should be done to this distinction between the President and the Presidency and I believe that the failure to recognize the distinction has caused trouble lately, and the kind and amount of trouble raises anxiety and wonder about where we are, and where we have been, and where we are going, and whether we still have our control.

Here is the trouble: beyond any doubt the most important domestic actions of the present President since he assumed the Presidency were those he took with respect to the declared increase in steel prices. He acted swiftly and effectively. By some he was praised for the result with good reason; by others he was blamed, but here lies the failure to make the distinction, the failure not yet generally recognized, our real weakness and real worry. Remove the personality of John Fitzgerald Kennedy from these actions so that your attachment or antipathy to the man is idled, conceptually place a faceless anonymity in the office—in the Presidency if you will—analyze the body of action down to the skeleton of power exercised and you will, I suggest, be properly disturbed.

In the early morning hours of April 13 in Philadelphia the rest of an American citizen was disturbed by a knock on the door. The knockers were Federal police, acting without the knowledge of their immediate superior, without writs or warrants, with no claim of wrongdoing against the citizen, investigators with no questions to ask that could not have been as well or better asked in the morning and with no right, constitutional or otherwise. They had a personal mandate from the Nation's highest enforcement officer, the Attorney General of the United States, a servant and not the master of the sleepy and perhaps frightened citizen, and one who took an oath to support not to violate the laws of the United States. In New York a similar event took place.

In the following hours a grand jury was impaneled in New York to investigate the possibility of criminal collusion in connection with the increased price of steel. This was a second grand jury. Another had been busy for a year with the same prospective defendants.

In the following hours, committees of the Congress undertook investigations, one of the stated ends being punishment.

In the Department of Defense companies which had raised their prices were denied Government business regardless of price, regardless of the public interest otherwise considered.

All this and much more. And why? Because the President did not wish steel prices increased. And what has this to do with the Presidency? Simply this: So great is the present power of the Office that the question has been raised as to whether the written law, Congress, the courts, and the American people will longer restrain it. We recall Andrew Jackson's crack about letting the Supreme Court enforce its own decision. This, I can assure you, is a vastly more advanced case.

"We have," a citizen wrote shortly ago, "lost our capacity for moral indignation." I am not sure he is right. I do believe, however, that in our swift drive toward desirable ends we are losing our respect for means. The genius of this Republic is still human liberty, the genius of liberty is law, and good law is a system of means by which all of us can freely and equally seek our individual or our common ends.

Press this steel situation a little further. What in fact did the companies do? They raised prices. In all freedom some of them raised their prices. I was personally astonished. I felt it to be unwise at that time. Yet it was, questions of collusion aside, a lawful act. There is no law, State or Federal, against raising the price of steel or toothbrushes or grass seed. We have a free domestic market. Admit the possibility, which we must, that the action was taken in good faith.

Now, if a citizen acting in good faith commits a lawful act and in return has applied to him unlawfully the utmost coercive power of the strongest Government on earth, where are we?

We are in a quandary, that's where. We are in a quandary because we thought we were safer than we are. For over 300 years we understood that the range of lawful acts was infinite and that so long as we honored them we would not be hurt. We knew where the fences were, because we had knowingly built them. We were born with an intuitive understanding of Lord Coke's cry to King James—"not under men but under God and law." We understand Mr. Justice Holmes when he said, in effect, "If a fellow wants to build a slaughterhouse and I look in the book and find nothing that says he can't—let him build the slaughterhouse."

We are in a quandary. The price of securities has fallen and fallen. Over \$70 billion in value has been sacrificed. Organized labor is querulous or mute. The Congress is more closely than ever scrutinizing those bills which would increase the Executive power and a number have been quietly shelved. And all this is disquieting because as a Nation we are feeding on fears we haven't had since our founding. In our quandary we wonder whether we are indeed relying on the certainty of laws or the uncertainty of men.

Where have we been? Over a long road this President did not take us. In this I defend him. The President is presently being criticized, seemingly for his acts when fairly we should bear the criticism for what we have permitted to be done to the Presidency over the years. We have asked the Presidency to do many things we should have done for ourselves. We have not kept the available instruments of civic achievement, municipal government, State government, congressional responsibility sharp and clean and bright. We have tolerated the multiplication of laws, by loose construction of our Constitution we did not understand or inquire into, by regulations we never knew of and still do not, by liberal grants of general powers, by acquiescence in the exercise of implied powers, by forgetting that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely, by forgetting that a system of checks and balances means internal checks upon and balances between the three great branches of government, and between the Federal Government and the States, by forgetting that unchecked and unbalanced power directed against our enemies today may be directed against us tomorrow.

Where are we going? The answer lies in the future and is speculative. As your Congressman I shall give you my opinion. Unless citizens act by public opinion and the franchise we shall continue to surrender rights to the Government, unchecked and unbalance its powers, and grant power to the Presidency until we shall have reverted to despotism.

Mr. Lincoln's word is good enough for me. The tyrant will not come to America from across the seas. If he comes he will ride down Pennsylvania Avenue from his inauguration and take his residence in the White House. We have, in the last 15 months in the Congress, inadvertently and carelessly we must assume, moved at a hellish rate to establish preconditions of dictatorship. There will be no coup d'etat. Rather, at the worst, there will be an extension and vigorous exercise of the powers we have granted.

Is the matter beyond control? I do not know and you're not sure. In all sadness I say I do not know. The ancients tell us that democracy degenerates into tyranny. We are the longest lived experiment in freedom and its ultimate success is not guaranteed. In my heart—with my faith—I do not believe we have passed the point of no return. I know that I would not have traveled a thousand miles to say these things if I thought it were. But I know it could happen here and I am dedicated to seeing it does not.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, June 5.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order entered on Tuesday, May 29, 1962, until Tuesday, June 5, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Harold J. Preston, Jr., pastor, United Presbyterian Church, Alton, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, Thou who art the way, the truth, and the life.

This day we approach Thy throne of grace with the praise of our lips and the worship of our lives. Thou art our God, who knows all human desires before they are voiced. Yet these desires cry for a hearing.

As the tasks of this day stretch before us, grant we pray, a special portion of Thy blessings and a clear vision of Thy purposes to all who are assembled here. Strengthen our faith and dedication to Thy causes which are our causes, allowing us to honor and glorify Thy name in all that we do or say.

May the deliberations and decisions of this day be based on a prayerful seeking of Thy wisdom and the correct exercise of our religious and political freedoms and responsibilities. Overpower our inadequacy with Thy sufficiency, our pride with Thy humility. Refashion us so we may become obedient sons and servants of the living God who offers new life to all who submit themselves to His direction and discipline. In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 31, 1962, was read and approved.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 10038, to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce, and H.R. 10124, be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They were improperly referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The subject matter of these bills should be properly before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A previous bill, H.R. 4590, which is superseded by H.R. 10038, had been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the present bill should likewise fall within that category.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this bill on the present Consent Calendar?

Mr. CELLER. No, it is not.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 95, on May 23, 1962, I am recorded as not voting. I was unable to be present due to illness. Had I been present I would have voted for H.R. 11737, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1963.

#### THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the calling of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

#### PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD, MARYLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6759) for the relief of the Prince Georges County School Board, Maryland.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

#### PARAPLEGIC HOUSING PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4012) to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10066) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal chords, with resulting complete aphonia.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN MATERIALS FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 473) providing the express approval of the Congress, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), for the disposition of certain materials from the national stockpile.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress expressly approve, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), the disposal of the following materials from the national stockpile in accordance with the plans of disposition published by General Services Administration in the Federal Register:*

(a) Approximately four hundred and forty thousand two hundred and forty-six pounds of silk noils (25 F.R. 8114, August 24, 1960; 27 F.R. 3643, April 17, 1962);

(b) Approximately ninety-six short tons of 91 per centum nickel in ingot form, approximately four short tons of sintered nickel powder in the form of "cups", and approximately nine short tons of cobalt in rondelle form averaging 97.9 per centum cobalt (26 F.R. 764, January 25, 1961);

(c) Cordage fiber consisting of approximately seven million five hundred thousand pounds of abaca fiber and approximately ten million pounds of sisal fiber (26 F.R. 803, January 26, 1961);

(d) Approximately three thousand five hundred long tons of vegetable tannins (quebracho, chestnut, and wattle extracts) (26 F.R. 2211, March 15, 1961);

(e) Approximately twenty-eight thousand eight hundred and sixteen short tons of celestite (26 F.R. 2239, March 16, 1961);

(f) Approximately four thousand four hundred and seventy-one troy ounces of platinum scrap and a quantity of nonferrous scrap consisting of approximately five hundred and twenty short tons of brass, seventy-four short tons of silicon bronze and copper, eleven short tons of beryllium copper, and one hundred and six short tons of zinc foil (26 F.R. 6490, July 19, 1961);

(g) Approximately fifty thousand long tons of pig tin (26 F.R. 8425, September 7, 1961);

(h) Approximately one hundred and fifty-five million six hundred and seventy-six thousand pounds of castor oil (26 F.R. 8577, September 13, 1961);

(i) Approximately two hundred sixty-five thousand pounds of cobalt oxides, and approximately five thousand five hundred pounds of cobalt carbonates (26 F.R. 9059, September 26, 1961);

(j) Approximately one thousand eight hundred and ninety long tons of chromite ore (26 F.R. 9793, October 18, 1961);

(k) Approximately sixty-five thousand four hundred and forty-seven pounds (gross weight) of ferrovanadium (26 F.R. 10196, October 31, 1961);

(l) Approximately sixty-three short tons of ferromanganese, and approximately four and one-half short tons of electrolytic manganese metal (26 F.R. 11508, December 5, 1961);

(m) Approximately ten million pounds of contained nickel and cobalt in the form of nickel oxide powder (27 F.R. 2260, March 8, 1962);

(n) Approximately five million pounds of molybdenum (27 F.R. 4005, April 26, 1962).

SEC. 2. All funds derived from the sales authorized by this concurrent resolution shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 1, line 5, strike out all that follows "Stockpile" down to the colon on line 7, page 1, and strike out the matter in the parentheses which immediately precedes the semicolon at the end of each subsection in section I.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, when the Consent Calendar was last called, I requested that House Concurrent Resolution 473 be passed over without prejudice. This was done because I felt the need for more background information concerning the resolution. Certain of my misgivings had been expressed to the Committee on Armed Services a few days before when the resolution was considered by that committee.

Let me make it perfectly clear that my position in this matter is not arbitrary, but is based upon my knowledge of the manner in which the surplus natural rubber disposal program has been and is being administered. I concur completely with the principle that all strategic and critical materials which are surplus to defense requirements should be disposed of as expeditiously as possible under the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act. On the other hand, I object to the administrative procedures which have been followed in the disposal of surplus natural rubber, and similar procedures may very well be in prospect with respect to other surplus materials. In my opinion, other surplus disposal programs which involve several billion dollars of the taxpayers' money ought not to be handled the way surplus rubber has been handled.

It is, of course, important to remember that the disposal of surplus strategic and critical materials from the Government stockpiles is not an undertaking designed to yield a profit. On the contrary, these programs involve the recognized loss of hundreds of millions of dollars and every effort should therefore be made to hold these losses to a minimum.

House Concurrent Resolution 473, which was passed over without prejudice on May 21, 1962, approves the disposal of 14 strategic and critical materials from the stockpile having an estimated current market value of approximately \$170 million. Seven of these materials are surplus to currently established objectives. The remaining seven items are

subspecification materials that do not meet current stockpile specifications. No total cost of acquisition is furnished in connection with these materials, since the major portion of them were acquired through transfer, without reimbursement from other agencies, principally the RFC.

Tin is the major surplus item involved and represents an acquisition cost in excess of \$120 million. According to the press, the Secretary of State has assured the International Tin Council that the United States "will consult with the Council and substantially interested governments before tin is released from the stockpile." While I have no information with respect to the extent to which consultations have either progressed or will be undertaken, the emergence of the rubber disposal pattern seems to be clear, and I think it likely that tin as rubber, may be disposed of in a manner designed to support the market rather than to protect the taxpayer's investment.

Notice of the intent to dispose of these materials has been published in the Federal Register pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and the pending resolution approves the disposal thereof "in accordance with the plan of disposition published by the General Services Administration in the Federal Register."

This is where I disagree with some of my distinguished colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. Section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act clearly states that the notice of disposal must be published in the Federal Register and that copies thereof must be transmitted to the Congress and to the Committees on Armed Services of each House thereof. It is further clearly required that the notice shall state the reasons for the "revised determination" of requirements, the amounts of the materials proposed to be released, the plan of disposition proposed to be followed and the date upon which the material is to become available for sale or transfer. The act further provides:

That no material constituting a part of the stockpiles may be disposed of without the express approval of the Congress except where the revised determination is by reason of obsolescence of that material for use in time of war.

In this particular case the question of obsolescence does not enter into the consideration.

In my opinion, the wording of the act as set forth above only requires that the Congress approve the disposal of the material and does not require the approval of the plan of disposition published in the Federal Register.

All disposals of surplus materials are conducted by the General Services Administration pursuant to directives issued by the Office of Emergency Planning which may be and are changed from time to time. The plans of disposal which are published in the Federal Register are broad in nature and perhaps represent no more or less than a considered opinion at that time as to the de-

sirable procedure to be followed. Maybe they don't even represent that.

Anyway, this much was clearly established at the hearings conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on House Concurrent Resolution 473. An official of the General Services Administration specifically requested that the record reflect that disposal plans were merely suggestions, not binding, and could be changed administratively at any time.

The amendment which I offer is designed to remove from the resolution specific approval by Congress of the so-called plans of disposal which have been published in the Federal Register. The amendment does no more than this. It does not in any way affect the items of material or the quantities of them which would be approved for disposal. Since the Congress would not be consulted in the event the administrative agencies change the plans of disposal it seems to me to be unwise for the Congress to endorse specifically the ones which have heretofore been published in the Federal Register.

My concern is accentuated due to the manner in which the surplus natural rubber program is and has been administered. I voted against House Concurrent Resolution 582, which authorized the disposal of surplus natural rubber because it was apparent to me that the Congress had not been supplied with full and complete information in connection therewith. My misgivings have been borne out by subsequent developments. Within the past year, the Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, conducted an exhaustive study of the execution of the rubber disposal program and our report was submitted to the House on April 2, 1962. I suggest that those of you who have not read that report study its conclusions and recommendations.

Up to the present time two of the subcommittee recommendations have been adopted entirely or in part. Nevertheless, despite assurances that other recommendations of the subcommittee are being considered there is still urgent need for improvement in the manner in which the surplus rubber disposal program is being conducted.

On May 21, 1962, the House passed H.R. 10595, a bill to facilitate the sale and disposal of Government stocks of extra long staple cotton. This bill is important and significant as related to the overall question of the disposal of surplus strategic and critical materials. It vests full and complete responsibility in the Secretary of Agriculture for the disposal of 50,000 bales of surplus long staple cotton. While the Secretary doubtlessly will, and should, consult with other interested departments and agencies of the Government, the final decision is his alone, which is as it should be. There is no room in this bill for buckpassing since the decisions of the Secretary of Agriculture are not subject to the approval of any other department or agency. I think it is significant that the Office of Emergency Planning tried to have this bill amended in a manner which would make the Secre-

tary of Agriculture little more than a figurehead, with the real decisions being made in other Government departments and agencies. Wisely, the Committee on Armed Services rejected this proposal. This was a good bill. It definitely fixed responsibility, and I hope will be used as a pattern for other similar legislation.

There is a sound reason for my reference to this particular bill. On December 10, 1959, the Office of Emergency Planning—then Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—issued a revised Defense Mobilization Order V-7 captioned "General Policies for Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling," which was published in the Federal Register on December 19, 1959. Under the provisions of this order, the disposal of surplus materials was, among other things, made subject to the "approval of the Departments of the Interior, Commerce, State, Agriculture, and Defense and other governmental agencies concerned." Although statutory responsibility for the disposal of surpluses is vested exclusively in the Office of Emergency Planning, that Office through the above policy decision divested itself of this responsibility by making its disposal decisions conditioned on the approval of other Government departments and agencies. The exercise of this authority by the Department of State made it possible for that Department to dominate the natural rubber disposal program and contributed to the unsatisfactory and disturbing conditions which exist today.

The report of the Committee on Government Operations, to which I have already referred, was critical of the provisions of Defense Mobilization Order No. V-7, and it seems noteworthy that this order was amended on April 25, 1962.

Under the amended order, however, the Office of Emergency Planning is apparently still unwilling to exercise its statutory responsibility, and its disposal decisions are now subject to the approval of the Departments of State or Interior or perhaps the President himself if the heads of these agencies acknowledge their incompetence to decide on disposals in the best interest of the United States.

I am seriously concerned over the entire question of disposal. The Congress approves the disposal of taxpayers' property valued at hundreds of millions of dollars, but at the present time the agency of the Government possessing the statutory authority to carry out the will of the Congress has failed to fully exercise its responsibility and the Congress has no authority or control over the procedures which may be adopted. I am inclined to the opinion that the basic act ought to be amended so that the Congress can at least definitely pinpoint the responsibility for these determinations in one specific department or agency of the Government.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, we have before us this resolution to approve the sale of surplus materials from the stockpile. I favor the resolution, but it needs to be perfected by my amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENDING CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY AUTHORITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11743) to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes. This bill merely extends the date that has been twice extended to the President since 1950. The purpose of the bill was set forth in the report as follows:

The purpose of the proposed measure is to provide for the continuation of the President's current standby authority to deal with the effects of an enemy attack upon this Nation. Under section 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C., app. 2297), these emergency powers would terminate on June 30, 1962.

#### HISTORY

As originally enacted, the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 provided that these standby emergency powers would terminate on June 30, 1954, or such earlier date as might be prescribed by concurrent resolution of the Congress. This termination date was extended to 1958 in 1954 and to June 30, 1962, by Public Law 85-514, dated July 11, 1958.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C., app. 2297), is further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1966."*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE 1202D CIVIL AFFAIRS GROUP

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9199) for the relief of certain officers and enlisted personnel of the 1202d Civil Affairs Group (Reinforcement Training), Fort Hamilton, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a statement at this point not only in reference to this bill, H.R. 9199, but also with reference to H.R. 9522. On the surface it would appear that there is a great deal of similarity between the two situations. As a matter of fact, the circumstances are quite different. It is therefore my intention to ask that the bill H.R. 9199 be passed over without prejudice, and to approve consideration of the bill H.R. 9522.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF A GOLD MEDAL TO BOB HOPE

The Clerk called Senate Joint Resolution 88.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas moments enriched by humor are moments free from hate and conflict, and therefore valued by mankind; and

Whereas Bob Hope has given to us and to the world many such treasured moments; and

Whereas he has done so unstintingly and unselfishly, with heavy demands on his time, talent, and energy; and

Whereas his contributions over a long period of years to the morale of millions of members of the United States armed services, in addition to those of our friends and allies, have been of immediate and enduring value; and

Whereas these contributions have been made during Christmas and at other times by personal contact in countless miles of travel around the globe, to the farthest outposts manned by American youth, during times of peace and war, often under dangerous conditions and at great personal risk; and

Whereas while at home he has given firm and imaginative support to humanitarian causes of every description; and

Whereas in all this Bob Hope has rendered an outstanding service to the cause of democracy, as America's most prized "Ambassador of Good Will" throughout the world: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to present in the name of the people of the United States of America a gold medal of appropriate design to Bob Hope in recognition of his aforesaid services to his country and to the cause of world peace.*

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such a medal to be struck and furnished to the President. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,500 for this purpose.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE U.S. MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9522) for the relief of certain members of the U.S. Marine Corps who incurred losses pursuant to the cancellation of a permanent change of station movement.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each member, of the First Light Anti-Aircraft Missile Battalion (Reinforced), United States Marine Corps, who was issued on or about July 1, 1961, a certificate in lieu of orders for a classified deployment and who actually dislocated his family, as designated by the Commandant, United States Marine Corps, the following allowances computed*

in accordance with law and the then applicable regulations:

(1) One dislocation allowance; and  
(2) Travel allowance for dependents travel performed to and from the locations to which dependents actually moved pursuant to the certificate.

SEC. 2. Travel, transportation, and dislocation allowances paid pursuant to the certificates before the effective date of this Act which were free from fraud and collusion are hereby validated.

SEC. 3. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for all amounts for which liability is relieved by section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 4. Payments made pursuant to this Act may not exceed more than \$25,000 in the aggregate.

SEC. 5. Payments authorized by this Act may not be made to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "member" and insert "member, as designated by the Commandant, United States Marine Corps."

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike ", as designated by the Commandant, United States Marine Corps,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BASIC SALARY IN CASES OF ASSIGNMENTS OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10265) to authorize the Postmaster General in his discretion to pay increased basic salary to postal field service employees for services performed before the expiration of 30 days following their assignments to duties and responsibilities of higher salary levels, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding, based on the committee report, that the cost of this proposal is approximately \$250,000 annually in the future. In addition, the accrued or accumulated cost for years past is approximately \$1,330,000. Obviously, on its surface, this bill does not qualify for the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### GRANTING CONSENT TO THE SOUTHERN INTERSTATE NUCLEAR COMPACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10618) granting the consent of Congress to the

southern interstate nuclear compact, and for related purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That it is hereby declared to be the national policy to encourage and recognize the performance of functions by the States with respect to the peaceful use of nuclear energy in its several forms. The Federal Government recognizes that many programs in nuclear fields can benefit from cooperation among the States, as well as between the Federal Government and the States. The importance of the interstate compact as one means for promoting such cooperation is hereby declared as part of the intention of Congress, already expressed in part in Public Law 86-373, to facilitate the use of State jurisdiction in and over portions of the development and regulatory nuclear field.

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby consents to the Southern Interstate Nuclear Compact, which compact is as follows:

##### "ARTICLE I. POLICY AND PURPOSE

"The party states recognize that the proper employment of nuclear energy, facilities, materials, and products can assist substantially in the industrialization of the South and the development of a balanced economy for the region. They also recognize that optimum benefit from and acquisition of nuclear resources and facilities requires systematic encouragement, guidance, and assistance from the party states on a cooperative basis. It is the policy of the party states to undertake such cooperation on a continuing basis; it is the purpose of this compact to provide the instruments and framework for such a cooperative effort to improve the economy of the South and contribute to the individual and community well-being of the region's people.

##### "ARTICLE II. THE BOARD

"(a) There is hereby created an agency of the party states to be known as the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board (hereinafter called the Board). The Board shall be composed of one member from each party state designated or appointed in accordance with the law of the state which he represents and serving and subject to removal in accordance with such law. Any member of the Board may provide for the discharge of his duties and the performance of his functions thereon (either for the duration of his membership or for any lesser period of time) by a deputy or assistant, if the laws of his state make specific provisions therefor. The Federal Government may be represented without vote if provision is made by federal law for such representation.

"(b) The Board members of the party states shall each be entitled to one vote on the Board. No action of the Board shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of all members representing the party states are present and unless a majority of the total number of votes on the Board are cast in favor thereof.

"(c) The Board shall have a seal.

"(d) The Board shall elect annually, from among its members, a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, and a treasurer. The Board shall appoint an Executive Director who shall serve at its pleasure and who shall also act as secretary, and who, together with the treasurer, shall be bonded in such amounts as the Board may require.

"(e) The Executive Director, with the approval of the Board, shall appoint and remove or discharge such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the Board's functions irrespective of the civil service, personnel, or other merit system laws of any of the party states.

"(f) The Board may establish and maintain, independently or in conjunction with any one or more of the party states, a suitable retirement system for its full-time employees. Employees of the Board shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect of the old-age and survivors insurance provided that the Board takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to Federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The Board may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate.

"(g) The Board may borrow, accept, or contract for the services of personnel from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, from any interstate agency, or from any institution, person, firm, or corporation.

"(h) The Board may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact any and all donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services (conditional or otherwise) from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or interstate agency, or from any institution, person, firm, or corporation, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

"(i) The Board may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Board may acquire, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

"(j) The Board shall adopt bylaws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business, and shall have the power to amend and rescind these bylaws, rules, and regulations. The Board shall publish its bylaws, rules, and regulations in convenient form and shall file a copy thereof, and shall also file a copy of any amendment thereto, with the appropriate agency or officer in each of the party states.

"(k) The Board annually shall make to the governor of each party state, a report covering the activities of the Board for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Board, which report shall be transmitted to the legislature of said state. The Board may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable.

##### "ARTICLE III. FINANCES

"(a) The Board shall submit to the executive head or designated officer or officers of each party state a budget of its estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that jurisdiction for presentation to the legislature thereof.

"(b) Each of the Board's budgets of estimated expenditures shall contain specific recommendations of the amount or amounts to be appropriated by each of the party states. One half of the total amount of each budget of estimated expenditures shall be apportioned among the party states in equal shares; one quarter of each such budget shall be apportioned among the party states in accordance with the ratio of their populations to the total population of the entire group of party states based on the last decennial federal census; and one quarter of each such budget shall be apportioned among the party states on the basis of the relative average per capita income of the inhabitants in each of the party states based on the latest computations published by the federal census-taking agency. Subject to appropriation by their respective legislatures, the Board shall be provided with such funds by each of the party states as are necessary to provide the means of establishing and maintaining facilities, a staff of personnel, and such activities as may be necessary to fulfill the powers and duties imposed upon and entrusted to the Board.

"(c) The Board may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under Article II(h) of this com-

compact, provided that the Board takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in this manner. Except where the Board makes use of funds available to it under Article II(h) hereof, the Board shall not incur any obligation prior to the allotment of funds by the party jurisdictions adequate to meet the same.

"(d) Any expenses and any other costs for each member of the Board in attending Board meetings shall be met by the Board.

"(e) The Board shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the Board shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its bylaws. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the Board shall be audited yearly by a qualified public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become part of the annual report of the Board.

"(f) The accounts of the Board shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection.

#### "ARTICLE IV. ADVISORY COMMITTEES

"The Board may establish such advisory and technical committees as it may deem necessary, membership on which to include but not be limited to private citizens, expert and lay personnel, representatives of industry, labor, commerce, agriculture, civic associations, medicine, education, voluntary health agencies, and officials of local, State and Federal Government, and may cooperate with and use the services of any such committees and the organizations which they represent in furthering any of its activities under this compact.

#### "ARTICLE V. POWERS

"The Board shall have power to—

"(a) ascertain and analyze on a continuing basis the position of the South with respect to nuclear and related industries.

"(b) encourage the development and use of nuclear energy, facilities, installations, and products as part of a balanced economy.

"(c) collect, correlate, and disseminate information relating to civilian uses of nuclear energy, materials, and products.

"(d) conduct, or cooperate in conducting, programs of training for State and local personnel engaged in any aspect of—

"(1) Nuclear industry, medicine, or education or the promotion or regulation thereof.

"(2) The formulation or administration of measures designed to promote safety in any matter related to the development, use or disposal of nuclear energy, materials, products, installations, or wastes.

"(e) Organize and conduct, or assist and cooperate in organizing and conducting, demonstrations of nuclear product, material, or equipment use and disposal and of proper techniques or processes for the application of nuclear resources to the civilian economy or general welfare.

"(f) Undertake such non-regulatory functions with respect to non-nuclear sources of radiation as may promote the economic development and general welfare of the region.

"(g) Study industrial, health, safety, and other standards, laws, codes, rules, regulations, and administrative practices in or related to nuclear fields.

"(h) Recommend such changes in, or amendments or additions to the laws, codes, rules, regulations, administrative procedures and practices or ordinances of the party states in any of the fields of its interest and competence as in its judgment may be appropriate. Any such recommendation shall be made through the appropriate state agency with due consideration of the desirability of uniformity but shall also give appropriate weight to any special circumstances which may justify variations to meet local conditions.

"(i) Prepare, publish and distribute (with or without charge) such reports, bulletins, newsletters or other material as it deems appropriate.

"(j) Cooperate with the Atomic Energy Commission or any agency successor thereto, any other officer or agency of the United States, and any other governmental unit or agency or officer thereof, and with any private persons or agencies in any of the fields of its interests.

"(k) Act as licensee of the United States Government or any party state with respect to the conduct of any research activity requiring such license and operate such research facility or undertake any program pursuant thereto.

"(l) Ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may bring about the prevention and control of nuclear incidents in the area comprising the party states, to coordinate the nuclear incident prevention and control plans and the work relating thereto of the appropriate agencies of the party states and to facilitate the rendering of aid by the party states to each other in coping with nuclear incidents. The Board may formulate and, in accordance with need from time to time, revise a regional plan or regional plans for coping with nuclear incidents within the territory of the party states as a whole or within any subregion or subregions of the geographic area covered by this compact.

#### "ARTICLE VI. SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENTS

"(a) To the extent that the Board has not undertaken an activity or project which would be within its power under the provisions of Article V of this compact, any two or more of the party states (acting by their duly constituted administrative officials) may enter into supplementary agreements for the undertaking and continuance of such an activity or project. Any such agreement shall specify its purpose or purposes; its duration and the procedure for termination thereof or withdrawal therefrom; the method of financing and allocating the costs of the activity or project; and such other matters as may be necessary or appropriate. No such supplementary agreement entered into pursuant to this article shall become effective prior to its submission to and approval by the Board. The Board shall give such approval unless it finds that the supplementary agreement or the activity or project contemplated thereby is inconsistent with the provisions of this compact or a program or activity conducted by or participated in by the Board.

"(b) Unless all of the party states participate in a supplementary agreement, any cost or costs thereof shall be borne separately by the states party thereto. However, the Board may administer or otherwise assist in the operation of any supplementary agreement.

"(c) No party to a supplementary agreement entered into pursuant to this article shall be relieved thereby of any obligation or duty assumed by said party state under or pursuant to this compact, except that timely and proper performance of such obligation or duty by means of the supplementary agreement may be offered as performance pursuant to the compact.

#### "ARTICLE VII. OTHER LAWS AND RELATIONS

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to—

"(a) Permit or require any person or other entity to avoid or refuse compliance with any law, rule, regulation, order or ordinance of a party state or subdivision thereof now or hereafter made, enacted or in force.

"(b) Limit, diminish, or otherwise impair jurisdiction exercised by the Atomic Energy Commission, any agency successor thereto, or any other Federal department, agency or officer pursuant to and in conformity with any valid and operative act of Congress.

"(c) Alter the relations between and respective internal responsibilities of the government of a party state and its subdivisions.

"(d) Permit or authorize the Board to exercise any regulatory authority or to own or operate any nuclear reactor for the generation of electric energy; nor shall the Board own or operate any facility or installation for industrial or commercial purposes.

#### "ARTICLE VIII. ELIGIBLE PARTIES, ENTRY INTO FORCE AND WITHDRAWAL

"(a) Any or all of the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia shall be eligible to become party to this compact.

"(b) As to any eligible party state, this compact shall become effective when its legislature shall have enacted the same into law; provided that it shall not become initially effective until enacted into law by seven states.

"(c) Any party state may withdraw from this compact by enacting a statute repealing the same, but no such withdrawal shall become effective until the governor of the withdrawing state shall have sent formal notice in writing to the governor of each other party state informing said governors of the action of the legislature in repealing the compact and declaring an intention to withdraw.

#### "ARTICLE IX. SEVERABILITY AND CONSTRUCTION

"The provisions of this compact and of any supplementary agreement entered into hereunder shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact or such supplementary agreement is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any participating state or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact or such supplementary agreement and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact or any supplementary agreement entered into hereunder shall be held contrary to the constitution of any state participating therein, the compact or such supplementary agreement shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining states and in full force and effect as to the state affected as to all severable matters. The provisions of this compact and of any supplementary agreement entered into pursuant hereto shall be liberally construed to effectuate the purposes thereof."

SEC. 3. Pursuant to article II(a) of the Southern Interstate Nuclear Compact, there shall be one representative of the Federal Government on the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board. The representative shall be appointed by the President and he shall report to the President either directly or through such agency or official as the President may specify. His compensation shall be in such amount not in excess of \$100 per diem, as the President shall specify, but the total amount of compensation payable in any one calendar year shall not exceed \$15,000: *Provided*, That if the representative be an employee of the United States, he shall serve without additional compensation. The compensation, travel expenses, office space, stenographic, and administrative services of the representative shall be paid from any available appropriations selected by the head of such agency or agencies as may be designated by the President to provide such expenses.

SEC. 4. The Atomic Energy Commission; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Labor; the Secretary of

Agriculture; and the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government are authorized, within available appropriations and pursuant to law, to cooperate with the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board.

Sec. 5. Copies of the annual reports made by the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board pursuant to article II(k) of the Southern Interstate Nuclear Compact shall be transmitted to the President and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress.

Sec. 6. The consent to the Southern Nuclear Compact given by this Act shall extend to any and all supplementary agreements entered into pursuant to article VI of such Compact: *Provided*, That any such supplementary agreement is only for the exercise of one or more of the powers conferred upon the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board by article V of such compact.

Sec. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

Sec. 8. The right is hereby reserved to the Congress or any of its standing committees to require the disclosure and furnishing of such information or data by the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board as is deemed appropriate by the Congress or any such Committee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### U.S. MARSHALS' FEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10651) to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of U.S. marshals, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That section 1921 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1921. United States marshals' fees

"Only the following fees of United States marshals shall be collected and taxed as costs, except as otherwise provided:

"For serving a writ of possession, partition, execution, attachment in rem, or libel in admiralty, warrant, attachment, summons, capias, or any other writ, order, or process in any case or proceeding, except as otherwise provided, \$3;

"For serving a subpoena or summons for a witness or appraiser, \$2;

"Where service is requested to be made on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the fees prescribed in the preceding two paragraphs shall be increased by 100 per centum;

"For forwarding any writ, order, or process to another judicial district for service, in addition to the prescribed fee, \$1;

"For the preparation of any notice of sale, proclamation in admiralty, or other public notice or bill of sale, \$3;

"For seizing or levying on property (including seizures in admiralty), disposing of the same by sale, setoff, or otherwise and receiving and paying over money, commissions of 3 per centum on the first \$1,000 of the amounts collected and 1½ per centum on the excess of any sum over \$1,000. If not disposed of by marshal's sale, the commission shall be in such amount as may be allowed by the court. In all cases in which the vessel or other property is sold by a public auctioneer, or by some party other than the marshal or his deputy, the commission herein authorized to be paid to the marshal shall be reduced by the amount paid to said auctioneer or other party;

"For the keeping of property attached (including boats, vessels, or other property attached or libeled) actual expenses incurred, such as storage, moving, boat hire, or other special transportation, watchmen's or keepers' fees, insurance, and \$3 per hour for each deputy marshal required for special services, such as guarding, inventorying, moving, and so forth. The marshals shall collect, in advance, a deposit to cover the initial expenses for such services and periodically thereafter such amounts as may be necessary to pay such expenses until the litigation is concluded;

"For copies of writs or other papers furnished at the request of any party, 30 cents per folio of one hundred words or fraction thereof;

"For all services in a criminal case except for the summoning of witnesses, a sum to be fixed by the court not exceeding \$25 where conviction is for a misdemeanor and not exceeding \$100 where conviction is for a felony;

"For necessary travel in serving or endeavoring to serve any process, writ, or order, 12 cents per mile, or fraction thereof, to be computed from the place where service is returnable to the place of service or endeavor; or, where two or more services or endeavors, or where an endeavor and a service, are made in behalf of the same party in the same case on the same trip, mileage shall be computed to the place of service or endeavor which is most remote from the place where service is returnable, adding thereto any additional mileage traveled in serving or endeavoring to serve in behalf of that party. When two or more writs of any kind, required to be served in behalf of the same party, on the same person, in the same case or proceeding, may be served at the same time, mileage on only one such writ shall be collected;

"No mileage fees shall be collected for services or endeavors to serve in the District of Columbia;

"The marshal may require a deposit to cover all fees and expenses herein prescribed."

Sec. 2. Section 1112 of the Act of March 3, 1901, entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia" (31 Stat. 1189, 1365; sec. 11-1510, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), as amended, is repealed.

Sec. 3. This Act shall become effective ninety days after enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of bills on the Consent Calendar.

#### NORTHWEST POWER

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial of May 26 from the San Bernardino Evening Telegram, of San Bernardino, Calif., very ably and clearly expresses my views regarding Senate bill 3153, and House bills 11264 and 11265.

It seems to me that policy which would be established by such legislation is not in the overall national interest, and certainly not in the best interest of my congressional district.

As the attached editorial so clearly states:

Under such a national policy Colorado River power, now used extensively in California, could be withdrawn at the expiration of existing contracts and used exclusively in the area of the Colorado River.

It is my understanding that similar sentiments were expressed during the hearings on S. 3153 before the Senate Interior Subcommittee on May 21.

The San Bernardino Evening Telegram editorial follows:

#### NORTHWEST POWER

California has been planning on the use of surplus power from the Federal plants in the Northwest in connection with the Feather River State water plan. Pumping of the water south from the Sacramento River delta will require more power than project itself can develop.

Under the existing law, California is entitled to preferential use from the Pacific Northwest.

But now comes Senate bill 3153 to provide that the area of the Pacific Northwest, both public and private users, could recall power used in California and put it to the exclusive use of the Northwest.

California is resisting the proposal. Hearings are underway this week before a Senate committee in Washington.

Thus, there is to be decided a new and strange national policy: Even if the people of the entire country pay for the construction of the Federal powerplants (such as in the Pacific Northwest), the area could claim the exclusive use of the power when and if there was the full local need, regardless of earlier use elsewhere.

Under such a national policy, Colorado River power, now used extensively in California, could be withdrawn at the expiration of existing contracts and used exclusively in the area of the Colorado River.

The country has heard the continuous chant of the public-power interests that Federal power belongs to all the people. Now they are out to demonstrate it belongs only to a portion of the people.

The Columbia River public-power project is losing about \$13 million a year, even with the governmental subsidy of lower interest rates and tax exemption. The people of the Northwest publicly urge industry to leave California, because power is cheaper in the Northwest.

Yet the people of California have been and will continue to be taxed to pay the subsidies and the losses of Columbia River power.

Under the existing law California is entitled to purchase Columbia River power. That is fine with the Northwest, except it now seeks a change in the law that would permit withdrawal of the power used to pump water for the California water plan, if and when the Northwest gets around to using all of the power.

Californians in Congress should call the strange line of reasoning to the attention of the entire Senate committee.

#### GENERAL EDUCATION BILL

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, for some months now, as chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, I have been working very closely with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN],

who is the minority leader of that subcommittee.

My goal has been to achieve a general education bill with bipartisan sponsorship. It has been my desire to keep the vital issue of education out of politics.

I was chagrined, therefore, when my attention was invited to a scurrilous attack on the integrity and honor of 800,000 schoolteachers, superintendents, and principals in the May 11 newsletter published by the Republican congressional committee. This attack charges the National Education Association with publishing "rigged" photographs in the April NEA Journal. The newsletter goes on to impugn the honor of the NEA.

Mr. Speaker, the NEA has spoken for itself in the pages of its May 25 NEA News. I include this article as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the NEA is not just a pile of brick and mortar on 16th Street. It is about 800,000 men and women who are hired by thousands of local school boards. These 800,000 are men and women to whom we entrust our children during their formative years. It is extremely regrettable that the Republican congressional committee, in its zeal to make education a political football has seen fit to use such smear words as "rigged" and "suspicious" in reference to these people.

The article from the NEA News follows:

#### NEA PICTURES NOT "RIGGED"

The Republican Congressional Committee issues a newsletter, widely disseminated among newspapers and radio and television stations, which on May 11, 1962, accused the National Education Association of "rigging" pictures published in the April 1962 issue of the NEA Journal to show deplorable conditions existing in some of the Nation's schools.

The pictures were not rigged, and two of the spokesmen quoted in the Republican Newsletter have, since its publication, repudiated the statements attributed to them there.

Uncritical newscasters and gullible editors of dope sheets have picked up the misrepresentations of the Republican Newsletter and spread them abroad. Teachers and especially members of NEA are entitled to the facts. We propose to give them to you here.

The Republican Newsletter says that "three of the worst appearing schoolbuildings, showing peeling paint, country stove heating plants, and a tumbledown shack serving as an industrial arts shop, were in Carter County, Tenn." It quotes John H. Neece, Carter County School Superintendent, as saying that these are to be replaced and adds that Neece is "suspicious of Federal aid programs."

Fact: The buildings are to be replaced. But they haven't yet been replaced and they were in use when the pictures were taken in January 1962, as they have been in use for many years. Neece used to teach school in these buildings and it was because of their dilapidated condition, he told NEA News, that he left teaching for several years. "There are some other schools that are just as bad elsewhere in the county," he told NEA Photographer Carl Purcell on May 22. And Neece said the he does favor Federal aid as advocated by NEA, with the money to be allocated by the States, in their discretion, for school construction or teacher salaries.

The Republican Newsletter quotes William Gershbein, principal of Brooklyn (N.Y.) P.S. 24, whose school was among those pictured as saying that a \$20,000 renovation job has just been completed; that the school is to

be painted; and that it is to be replaced. (Why paint it if you are going to replace it?)

Fact: Gershbein told NEA News on May 22 that he did not know whether the renovation had cost \$20,000 or more than that, or less. He just didn't know. Asked what had actually been done, he said partitions had been knocked out to make four larger rooms out of six smaller ones. The school, which is 99 years old, had been "scheduled for replacement" for many years, Gershbein said, but its replacement has always been postponed when the annual budget is made up. Currently it is scheduled for replacement before 1965.

The Republican Newsletter refers to the picture of Sundland School, Phoenix, Ariz. (where double sessions are held), and implies that this picture was "rigged" because: "Sundland is located in the Roosevelt School District, one of Phoenix's poorest." It quotes the Governor's secretary as saying that there are plans for a new school and more classrooms.

Fact: Double sessions were being held there when the picture was taken in January 1962 and not even the newsletter alleges that the contemplated new construction will eliminate double sessions in this district, "one of Phoenix's poorest."

The Republican Newsletter quotes John M. Lumley, NEA director of Federal relations, as being satisfied that the NEA Journal "told only one side of the story," in the newsletter's own phrase.

Fact: A page of the eight-page picture supplement in the April NEA Journal was headed: "There are many excellent, well-equipped, capably staffed schools in every State, but there are not enough." Much of that page was given over to a photograph described as "well-equipped library made possible by Federal funds."

Aside from these specifics, misrepresented by the newsletter of the Republican congressional committee, NEA members should know that it was not the intention, in this picture feature, to hold up any particular community to ridicule or abuse—the purpose was to show all too frequent conditions as they exist in many States. As Superintendent Neece of Carter County said: "There are some other schools that are just as bad elsewhere."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### ATLANTA SUFFERS GREAT LOSS IN PARIS AIR TRAGEDY

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, sometimes there are events so tragic, so numbing, they are beyond the power of words to describe.

Such a tragedy struck Georgia yesterday when a plane crashed on takeoff at a Paris airport, snuffing out the lives of 130 persons aboard.

Atlanta was hardest hit, and bears the brunt of this terrible disaster. One hundred and six of those losing their lives were from the metropolitan Atlanta area; three were from nearby Griffin, two

from West Point, two from Elberton, and two from Marshallville. Six of those aboard the jet liner were from areas out of the State of Georgia.

The plane was an Air France jetliner, chartered to transport to Atlanta from Paris a group of people, most of them Atlantans, returning home from a European tour sponsored by the Atlanta Art Association.

The flight from Paris to America on yesterday was to have been a joyous homecoming for those who began the tour on May 9. The tragic, terrible occurrence has cast grief and sorrow throughout the community, our congressional district, our State, and the Nation.

Many of those aboard the plane were close personal friends of mine. Today I am sad and my heart is heavy.

Atlanta, and Georgia, as well as our Nation, all have suffered a tremendous loss. Those who made up the party going on this tour came from outstanding civic, business, and cultural leaders of our section. They will be greatly missed in all those capacities. The grief and sorrow of their loved ones and friends will be deeper because of the closer ties which bound them to us.

Mrs. Davis and I extend our deep and heartfelt sympathy to their families and loved ones in this time of bereavement.

The following is a list of the victims of the tragic disaster:

Those from Atlanta:

Mrs. C. A. Adair of 58 Montclair Drive NE.

Mr. and Mrs. Tom Chris Allen of 3633 Tuxedo Road NW.

Mrs. Henrietta C. Ayer of 536 West Paces Ferry Road NW.

Paul Barnett, 3456 Piedmont Avenue NE.

Mrs. Ralph J. Barry of 2914 Arden Road NW.

Mrs. E. W. Bartholomai of 3148 Lenox Road NE.

Mrs. W. P. Bealer of 286 Colonial Homes Drive.

Mr. and Mrs. George Beattie of 3047 East Pine Valley Road NW.

Mrs. Frances Beers of 2637 Peachtree Road NE.

Mrs. Marion T. Benson of 3301 Habersham Road NW.

Mr. and Mrs. Randolph Berry of 376 Manor Ridge Drive NW.

Mrs. E. Milton Bevington of 594 Valley Green Drive NE.

Mr. and Mrs. Roy Bixler, 1137 Mason Woods Drive.

Mrs. David C. Black, 3567 Paces Valley Road NW.

Katherine Bleckley of 717 Piedmont Avenue NE.

Dr. and Mrs. Harry Boon of 167 Boling Road NE.

Mr. and Mrs. Morris Brandon, Jr., of 671 West Paces Ferry Road NW.

Mrs. Fred Brine and Dorothy Brine of 164 Peachtree Way NE.

Mr. and Mrs. Fred W. Bull, Ellen Bull and Betsy Bull of 495 Westover Drive NW.

Mrs. Mary Bull of Ponce de Leon Apartments.

Mrs. Ezekiel S. Candler of 3796 Club Drive NE.

Mr. and Mrs. William A. Cartledge of 4 Maddox Drive NE.

W. D. Cogland of 874 Vera Street SE.

Mr. and Mrs. Reuben Crimm of 637 Old Ivy Road NE.

Mrs. L. W. Dilts of 505 Timber Valley Road NE.

Paul Doassans, Air France representative in Atlanta, 31 Lakeview Avenue NE.

Mr. and Mrs. Saul Gerson of 1240 Carol Lane NW.

Mr. and Mrs. E. B. Glenn of 15 Vernon Road NW.

Mrs. J. M. Henson of 12 Chatham Road NW.

Mr. and Mrs. Redfern Hollins of 1208 Moores Mill Road NW.

Mrs. Ewing Humphries of 3167 Downwood Circle.

Mr. and Mrs. C. Baxter Jones, Jr., of 3475 Tuxedo Road NW.

Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Kaye of 801 Douglas Road NE.

Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Lanier of 2575 Howell Mill Road NW.

Mr. and Mrs. Thomas G. Little of 1215 East Beechwood Drive NW.

Mrs. Hinton Longino of 2983 Habersham Road NW.

Louise Loomis of 239 15th Street NE.

Dr. and Mrs. Allen P. McDonald of 1938 Peachtree Road NW.

Dr. and Mrs. Christopher J. McLoughlin of 417 Hillside Drive NW.

Ruth McMillan of 85 Beverly Road NE.

Mrs. William Merritt of 184 Peachtree Battle Avenue NW.

Mrs. Lawton Miller of a Peachtree Memorial Drive address.

Mrs. Roy Minier of 35 Walker Terrace NE.

Mrs. Robert Emmett Mitchell of 2025 Peachtree Street.

Ruth Morris of 710 Peachtree Street.

Miss Anna Mulcahy of 2795 Peachtree Road NE.

Mr. and Mrs. David J. Murphy of 87 East Wesley Road NE.

Robert S. Newcomb of Ponce de Leon Apartments.

Margaret Nutting of 825 Piedmont Avenue NE.

Mr. and Mrs. Del R. Paige of 2952 Howell Mill Road NW.

Mrs. Harvey Payne, 228 Camden Road NE.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Pegram of 3180 Arden Road NW.

Mrs. P. H. Perkins, Jr., of 5450 Peachtree-Dunwoody Road NW.

Homer S. Prater, Jr., of 3687 Peachtree Road NE.

Mrs. Marion Pruitt of 3183 Argonne Drive NW.

Mrs. Clifford N. Ragsdale of 2814 Peachtree Road NW.

Mrs. William Richardson of 38 Peachtree Circle NE.

Mr. and Mrs. Roby Robinson of Biltmore Apartments NE.

Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Rooke of 3584 Tuxedo Road NW.

Mrs. Helen Seydel of 15 Lakeland Drive NE.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles A. Shaw of 61 Castle Falls Drive NE.

Mrs. R. K. Stow of 422 Emory Drive.

Mrs. M. D. Therrel of 2000 West Paces Ferry Road NW.

Mrs. T. L. Tidmore of 86 Sheridan Drive NE.

Mrs. Paul Turner (Margaret Turner) of 60 Montgomery Ferry Drive NE.

Mrs. Frank Virgin of 1 Vernon Road NW.

Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Wien and Joan Wien of 3700 North Stratford Road NE.

Mrs. Rosalind Williams of 3945 Club Drive NE.

Mrs. Lysle Williamson of 42 25th Street NW.

Mrs. Walter Wilson, 3349 Piedmont Road NE.

Vasser Woolley of 1071 Techwood Drive NW.

Mr. and Mrs. Sykes Young of 3496 Knollwood NW.

Those not from Atlanta:

Mrs. Theodosia L. Barnett of 2113 Southview Avenue, Tampa, Fla.

Mrs. Leslie Blair of 509 Whitlock Avenue, Marietta, Ga.

Miss Dolly Brooks of Marian Apartments, Griffin, Ga.

Mr. and Mrs. Morgan Cantey of West Point, Ga.

Mrs. James R. Cowan of 904 Church Street, Marietta, Ga.

Mr. and Mrs. Forrest Cumming of 204 West Poplar Street, Griffin, Ga.

Douglas Davis of Hapeville and Paris.

Mrs. William I. Hill of Montgomery, Ala.

Mrs. Mary Ansley Howland of 212 South Candler Street, Decatur, Ga.

Miss Marghretta B. Luty of 601 Tasker Street, Ridley Park, Pa.

Mrs. Frank McPherson of Montgomery, Ala.

Mr. and Mrs. Louis Patz of Elberton, Ga.

Mrs. L. O. Rickey of 541 Virginia Drive, Winter Park, Fla.

Mrs. William King Self of 701 Peyton Circle, Marks, Miss.

Mrs. Fred Sorrow of Duluth, Ga.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Turner of Marshallville, Ga.

#### HODGES HEDGES

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 1962, a near miracle occurred here on Capitol Hill.

On that day the Federal bureaucracy momentarily lost control of one of its supposed bosses.

The temporary—very temporary, I might add—escapee from the well-insulated isolation of a Cabinet member's private office was the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce.

Before I go any further, let me make it abundantly clear that I am not being critical of Secretary Hodges.

I have admiration for what he did—and also a measure of sympathy for the unhappy consequences he obviously has incurred.

But I have no criticism of him.

Not even for his subsequent public recanting or for his hasty retreat back to the protective custody of his bureaucratic keepers.

But I must come to the point.

Secretary Hodges' horrendous offense was that he blurted out the obviously uncensored opinion that there are both too many employees, and also a considerable number of obsolete functions, in the Federal bureaucracy.

This heresy occurred before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, where Secretary Hodges had been sent to plug for the administration's billion-dollar pay raise for Federal employees.

I am sure that it is evident by now to Secretary Hodges that this is a case in which truth is the poorest possible defense.

At the conclusion of my remarks today I will include a documentation of this matter—including Secretary Hodges' testimony and the surface indications of the heavy rumblings of bureaucratic consternation and disapproval triggered by Secretary Hodges' amazing indiscretion.

I say "surface indications" because no mere Member of Congress could possibly hope to be privy to all of the violent reverberations and repercussions within the bureaucracy to such a gross betrayal as Secretary Hodges committed.

I should mention, however, that the Cabinet member's lapse was gravely compounded by his veiled hint, in this testimony, that civil service regulations and procedures might somehow hamper any pruning operations in the bureaucratic jungle.

This has brought forth a swift and stern rebuke—in the form of a letter to the Secretary of Commerce from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Hon. John W. Macy, Jr.

And even a generous offer of the good offices of the Civil Service Commission, if Secretary Hodges really means business.

Come to think of it, Chairman Macy does have a point—if he really means business.

Secretary Hodges was not too specific as to what functions are obsolete, although he hinted that some of them are all of 40 years old.

And he was not too specific as to what jobs might be eliminated.

The bureaucracy ought to be grateful to Secretary Hodges for that much. There is nothing it detests—or resists—quite as vehemently as specifics.

Judging from Mr. Macy's letter—which I am also inserting following my remarks—he is inviting Secretary Hodges either to put up or to shut up.

And if Mr. Macy really means this, perhaps the bureaucracy ought to shift its anger in his direction.

In any case, Chairman Macy is second in line among the small number of volunteers offering their assistance to Secretary Hodges and his embryonic crusade.

The able, distinguished, and conscientious chairman of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Davis], took Secretary Hodges up on his proposition—almost before the Secretary had finished voicing his radical and iconoclastic views.

As a member of this genuinely bipartisan subcommittee, I have great curiosity—and well-disciplined optimism—as to what will ensue.

I understand that the subcommittee's very capable staff is currently in consultation with the personnel people in Secretary Hodges' Department of Commerce.

Presumably at some later date our subcommittee will hear witnesses from that Department.

I doubt if we will get any specifics on job reductions or functions eliminations. And I am reasonably sure that Secretary Hodges will not be one of the witnesses.

By that time the bureaucracy will have the whole matter, including the Secretary of Commerce, back on the track.

Well, it was a good try, Mr. Secretary. And I suggest that you console yourself with the thought that your own boss has not done very much better.

As the Democratic nominee for President in 1960, Senator Kennedy charged

that the administration then in power had expanded the Federal payroll to an alltime high.

And a few days before the 1960 election he said, at an airport rally in Roanoke, Va.:

They have added 106,000 new Federal employees. I think it is about time the American people knew.

Well, as a member of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee who opposed this bureaucratic buildup under the Republican administration, I think it is about time the American people knew that during the first year of the Kennedy administration 76,900 more employees were added to the Federal payrolls.

And I think it is also about time the American people knew that under present plans this figure will be further swelled by some 100,000 additional Federal employees by July 1 of next year.

Despite the passing, momentary indiscretions of short-time fugitive Hodges, the bureaucracy is not doing too badly.

And, incidentally, the hard-pressed American taxpayer and the still deficit-financed Federal budget, are not doing too well.

The testimony of Secretary Hodges, which precipitated all of the bureaucratic furor, followed some characteristically pertinent comments on steadily increasing governmental and payroll costs by our able colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Here is the record of that testimony:

Mr. Gross. How in the world are we ever going to return to fiscal sanity in this country under the circumstances that exist if we continue to do these things? You sit in a key spot in the Government and I would like to know what you think about it.

Secretary Hodges. Mr. Gross, I made a recommendation to a Senate committee last year when they raised the question with me: "I thought you were in favor of saving money?" And I say I am, from my background, in favor of saving money, but I will say parenthetically I am in favor of good men, whatever it takes to get them. I said to the Senate committee: "If you will give the Department of Commerce the leeway of taking 10 percent of its total budget and doing away with those jobs that ought not to be there, we will save some money there if the civil service rules are such you do not find it too difficult to do that." If the Congress can do that I think we can save money.

Thereupon I asked Secretary Hodges:

Do you have any specific recommendations as to how the Congress could implement that very excellent suggestion?

The testimony continues:

Secretary Hodges. We requested of this particular committee, and we renew our request at this moment, that we think one of the soundest things that could happen is if you fixed it so that a department would be encouraged to cut out things that may have been started 40 years ago that we do not need any more but nobody does anything because everybody thinks a budget is a good budget if you do not ask for an increase.

Mr. Davis. Will the gentleman yield?

The Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of this committee has for some 8 or 9 years been trying to put into effect the very principle you mention. That is, we have taken the position that approximately 10 percent of Federal personnel can be eliminated if a real effort were made to do it, and we have been working very earnestly toward that

objective for many years. I am glad you brought that up, and could I ask this direct question: Could our staff take up with any particular person in your organization this specific question and together attempt to work it out?

Secretary Hodges. We would be very happy to, Mr. Davis.

Mr. Davis. Would you designate somebody, either now or in the next few days, with whom our staff could consult looking toward that objective?

Secretary Hodges. I would be glad to.

Mr. Davis. Thank you.

In view of Secretary Hodges' references, in the foregoing testimony, to statements made previously before a committee of the other body, I think it is in order to include this relevant information. Testifying before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Commerce Department appropriation, May 15, 1961, Mr. Hodges made two statements bearing on matters of personnel administration.

In one he said:

There is proposed a new provision to grant discretionary authority to me to transfer limited amounts between appropriations made for payment of salaries and expenses in order to provide me with a degree of flexibility in carrying out the many programs of the Department, if it becomes apparent to me that improvements can be made by such a shift of funds.

He also testified:

Now we are asking, Mr. Chairman, something which will be a little bit radical from the standpoint of your budgeting. We should like to have 10 percent of our budget flexible, so that we can save money somewhere and put it somewhere else. I will admit, before you asked, that that is a dangerous procedure in certain cases, and I suppose you would have to do it on a broad basis, but I am sure we can save money if we can do that. Whether you allow it or not, we will strive to save money anyhow, and I propose, as soon as we can get our breath, maybe in the last half of the year, to ask our various bureaus to see if they cannot show us how they can do their job with less people, and still keep the basic programs going.

I do not profess to know exactly what Secretary Hodges had in mind in his testimony last year before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee—or this year before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

However, Secretary Hodges' testimony before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service evoked this approving editorial comment the following day—May 24—in the Washington News:

#### DEADWOOD IN WASHINGTON

Coming as it does from a top official in the Government, this is stunning news, and we hope it is much more than a passing remark:

Commerce Secretary Hodges, testifying before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, said the taxpayers could save all sorts of money if the Government would get rid of the deadwood on its payroll.

Mr. Hodges said about 10 percent of the employees in his Department alone were doing jobs started 40 years ago and now just aren't needed.

At a recent count, there were nearly 2½ million civilian employees in the executive departments alone. The annual payroll runs well beyond \$14 billion a year. Even a 10-percent cut would amount to a worthwhile windfall to the taxpayers.

The Commerce Secretary implied some of the fault lay with the civil service system. This sounds a little strange, but if the civil service system is working to keep unneeded employees and to perpetuate useless bureaus and agencies, it can stand an overhaul.

Mr. Hodges agreed to put his personnel experts to work with the House committee staff on this situation—and if he can help bring about a reversal of the old Washington practice of never stopping anything once it was started maybe the Government at long last can get off its perennial deficit kick.

And it also provoked this sharply disapproving letter to the John Cramer "9 to 4:30" column of the Washington News of May 26:

#### KNOCKS DEADWOOD

(By John Cramer)

We get letters:

"DEAR MR. CRAMER: If I may, I'd like to give you the views of at least one person in Commerce (me) on Secretary Hodges' statement about 10-percent deadwood in this Department.

"It isn't bad enough that Secretary Hodges brought in so many of his own personnel—personal and political friends, but he also allowed them to bring in their pet poodles. As to his personnel experts to work with the House committee staff—brother, that's all we need—another survey. He already has surveyors who are surveying the surveyors. What would this group be called? In fact, there are so many surveys going on that in order to do your work we are forced to take some of it home with us.

"Many of us here in Commerce have had a loyalty to the Department that is rarely seen in any working group. We have been (past tense) proud to work here. We've had pride in our accomplishments, integrity, and ability to do a good job. Heretofore we've been encouraged by our boss—not condemned. We're still working hard but, believe me, it's quite a blow to have our own Secretary publicly state that we're overloaded with deadwood.

"I think Mr. Hodges would do well to wise up to the fact that talent is being wasted simply because he wants to revamp the Department. Many Commerce people are being ignored, bypassed, and in general considered to be deadwood by this so-called New Frontier who thinks that experience and intelligence don't count unless they brought it in. He doesn't believe that experience is the best teacher—but he'll learn—and by experience.

"While I'm on the subject of Mr. Hodges, he should also investigate the morale in his Department. In all my years in Commerce I've never seen or heard of such hate and depression. If we could all quit—most of us would. Then we'd see—maybe there wouldn't be much of his so-called deadwood, but I'd sure feel sorry for the deadheads left.

"In fact, we are all beginning to hate Commerce, dread coming to work, but most of all, we detest a Secretary who doesn't bother to stick up for his own Department.

"A FORMER DEMOCRAT."

Meanwhile another Washington columnist—Jerry Klutz of the Washington Post—gave this report, on May 24, of Secretary Hodges' testimony:

Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges believes that part of the cost of the President's pay plan could be offset by better management in Federal agencies.

He told the House Civil Service Committee that some Federal activities, 40 or more years old, are obsolete, and should be either curtailed or abolished. He suggested the relating of Federal pay to more efficient operations.

Representative DAVIS, Democrat of Georgia, immediately took note of the proposal and

asked Hodges to designate a Commerce official to work with his Manpower Utilization Subcommittee on the project. Hodges agreed.

Also the U.S. News & World Report, in its June 4 issue, carried this report on the same matter:

#### HODGES' ADVICE: CUT DOWN FEDERAL JOBS

WASHINGTON.—By firing unneeded Federal workers, the Government could save all kinds of money, said Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges.

The Cabinet member told Congress 10 percent of the people in his own department held jobs started 40 years ago which just aren't needed now.

Mr. Hodges, who testified in support of the proposed 3-year, \$1 billion pay boost for Federal workers, promised to help work out a formal proposal for paring the Government payroll.

Thereafter the process of recanting began. The June 1 column, "The Federal Spotlight," by Joseph Young, of the Washington Star, included this item:

#### EASES FEARS

Commerce Secretary Hodges has acted to ease the fears of Commerce Department employees that he will fire 10 percent of the personnel.

In pay raise testimony before the House Civil Service Committee recently, Mr. Hodges, in answer to a question, made a statement which was interpreted to mean that 10 percent of the Department's employees were expendable and that the Department should be given the budget flexibility by Congress to get rid of them.

However, Mr. Hodges has now issued a statement declaring that no one in Commerce need fear losing his job if he is performing satisfactorily on work that Congress and the administration consider ought to be continued.

The following day—June 2—Jerry Klutz, in the Washington Post's "Federal Diary," offered this comment:

Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges has reassured his employees that none need fear losing his job if he is doing satisfactory work on a program both Congress and the administration wants continued.

His statement should clear up a general misinterpretation of his testimony before the House Civil Service Committee. At that time he merely suggested that part of the cost of the President's pay reform plan could be offset by more efficient operations. He further amplified his remarks as follows:

"I didn't refer to any specific dollars or number of employees, nor did I refer to firing anyone, nor did I have any bureau in mind.

"I've found that some positions and functions are continued when in many cases they might have been eliminated or people re-assigned to new functions if the budget structure allowed it."

Hodges would like Congress to give him authority to try out his plan by permitting him to transfer up to 10 percent of the budget of any bureau to another agency.

Finally, I include for the RECORD the letter of the Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, to Secretary Hodges, relative to his testimony:

HON. LUTHER H. HODGES,  
Secretary of Commerce,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have read news accounts of your testimony to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee relative to your desire to cut our functions and eliminate unnecessary jobs in the Department of Commerce.

May I assure you that there is nothing in the civil service laws and rules which require that any department keep on its rolls employees who are not needed, or that it continue functions that are no longer necessary. What is required by the relevant laws is that employee layoffs or discharges be accomplished in an orderly and equitable fashion. The rules for layoffs in the Federal service are very similar to what good conscience and community opinion would require of any private corporation.

To help you with personnel problems attendant on your reaching the level of employment which you decide is the proper level in your department, I am glad to volunteer the services of the Civil Service Commission staff. While I recognize that the decision as to which functions and jobs to cut is entirely yours as the responsible management official, the Commission stands ready to give you direct assistance, if needed, in making sure that layoffs are carried out in accordance with relative standing of employees. We would also like to assist laid-off employees in obtaining other jobs.

As a point of contact for this offer of assistance I have designated the Commission's executive director, Warren B. Irons, who will be prepared to meet with your administrative and personnel people at their earliest convenience. I am sending a copy of this communication to Representative JAMES C. DAVIS because of the interest he also expressed in helping you work out this problem. Please be assured of our desire to render all assistance possible.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,  
Chairman.

#### ALEXANDRIA DAILY TOWN TALK MISLEADS PUBLIC ABOUT FARM BILL — FARMERS, CONSUMERS, AND TAXPAYERS ARE HOODWINKED BY PROPAGANDA CURTAIN

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere regret that I note a growing tendency on the part of some persons to evaluate legislative proposals on the basis of their connection with the Kennedy administration rather than on their own merits and whether they would serve the Nation's best interests. An example is the farm bill. In recent weeks it has been denounced not only by paid lobbyists but by persons who are unfamiliar with its contents and purposes and with the changes and improvements made in the bill by the House Agriculture Committee and by the Senate, which passed the bill May 25.

Many of these persons have also forgotten that we now have in storage surplus stocks of farm commodities that have cost the Treasury over \$7.5 billion. Over the last 10 years the annual net expenditures for price supports—the cost of adding to the surplus—has fluctuated between \$1 billion and \$3 billion. Further, annual storage costs alone exceed the fantastic sum of \$1 billion. Most of this surplus is in wheat—\$2.5 billion—and feed grains—\$3 billion—and it accumulated principally in the last 8 years

prior to 1961 due to unworkable legislation.

These surpluses hang menacingly over the market. They threaten a collapse of farm income and a depression of market prices for grain, cattle, hogs, and land values. Communities and towns that are based on an agricultural economy are imperiled.

#### MIDWEST FIGHTS FOR STATUS QUO

If Congress does not correct this problem now this foolhardy and costly surplus accumulation will continue. Chaos will be the inevitable result. Yet strong vested interests in the Midwest are fighting with all their wealth and strength to preserve the farm glut status quo.

They have enlisted the support of farm organizations, newspapers, magazines, and politicians to help them perpetuate this storage and price-support bonanza. And many persons, good faith opponents of the Kennedy administration, are unwittingly and innocently playing into the hands of the midwestern vested grain interests by condemning the farm proposal.

Contrary to the propaganda H.R. 11222 as amended will not affect any commodity not already subject to a farm program. It will, however, save millions of dollars and reduce the surplus and overproduction. It will not hurt farmers, but it will hurt the grain storage interests. It will help consumers and taxpayers.

#### LOUISIANA INTERESTS PROTECTED

I voted in committee to report this bill to the House floor for consideration, reserving the right to oppose it on the floor unless it is satisfactorily amended. While it was under committee consideration I helped remove from the bill certain undesirable provisions, provisions such as mandatory milk quotas for dairy farmers, authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to condemn and purchase land for recreation, and the transfer of surplus commodities to the United Nations for distribution. As late as last week the Farm Bureau was still circulating literature in Louisiana implying that these provisions were still in the bill. Before the bill cleared the committee I made sure that there would be no new milk legislation this year and that other commodities important to Louisiana would be dealt with satisfactorily. In addition to the Grant amendment exempting deficit feed grain areas from the effect of the bill my amendment for the release and reapportionment of feed grain acres, a provision also in the cotton law that has strong support among Louisiana cotton farmers, was adopted by a vote of 23 to 11.

Some persons who had previously applauded my diligence in helping to perfect this bill in committee have subsequently assailed my committee position to report it. Others, avowed opponents of the Kennedy administration, have viewed my action as a dread Kennedy victory rather than as an integral part of a good faith effort to obtain constructive legislation to deal with the scandalous cost of overproduction and the storage of the farm surplus. Others, with no prior knowledge of this matter, have simply read in the Alexandria Daily

Town Talk that I have "violated principle."

On April 24 I told a meeting of 150 farmers in Alexandria, La., that we could not perfect the bill in committee and that therefore there probably would be a floor fight. I further said that the committee was at an impasse, because of the failure of the divided committee to focus and agree upon a workable alternative solution and that I would not obstruct the bill in committee. My unequivocal statement was accurately reported the following day in the Town Talk, although this newspaper has subsequently neglected to point out this significant information in articles referring to my committee vote.

In a distorted article, Time, on May 18, implied by innuendo that my committee position was influenced either by a flight on which the Louisiana congressional delegation accompanied the President to New Orleans on May 4 or by a conference that I had with the President the following week. Yet my position had been made a matter of public record for over 10 days at the time of the alleged Presidential influence. The New Orleans trip had been scheduled for over 2 months.

No issue was made of my position expressed in the April 24 Alexandria public meeting either by farmers or by paid Farm Bureau officials at the meeting. No issue was made by my hometown press until the national press made it an issue of partisan party politics. And no issue was subsequently made by paid Farm Bureau officials in Louisiana until a rift occurred in the internal politics of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation and until pressure was applied from Chicago by the American Farm Bureau Federation to try to get me to block the bill in committee.

Had I tried to obstruct this bill in committee I would have been arbitrary and negative, particularly in view of what was accomplished before the bill cleared the committee as I have previously cited. For all practical purposes we killed the original bill in committee and developed our own farm proposal after months of conscientious hard work.

Some concern about this bill is based on the misconception that in the absence of this proposal the Federal Government would not be deeply involved in agriculture. Another misconception is that this bill would completely regiment farmers. There are also misconceptions about the commodities affected. H.R. 11222 does not deal with cotton, rice, peanuts, sugar, and tobacco, which are already under production control. It does not deal with cattle and other meat animals, which are not under control. It deals with wheat, which is already under control, feed grains, which are now subject to price supports but no production controls, and with milk, which is now price supported but not controlled. As I have previously mentioned there will be no milk legislation, and this dairy section will be deleted on the floor.

#### FARM BILL OPPONENTS WANT PRICE SUPPORTS

Another misconception is that the legislative and lobby opponents of this bill advocate getting the Government out of

agriculture. The fact is that opponents of this proposal want the Federal Government to continue to support the price of feed grains, but they resist regulation or production. They advocate what is called an open-end farm program calling for price supports and unlimited production, under which most of the costly surpluses of wheat and feed grains have been accumulated.

The average citizen, including farmers, sees no justification for Government involvement in agriculture, irrespective of the cost. This is my personal predilection about the role of the Federal Government, whether we are talking about agriculture, transportation, or education, which is consistently demonstrated by my voting record in the House of Representatives. To many persons the arguments among farmers and among farm organizations are merely intramural disputes over similar subsidy schemes. These views gain force when some farm plans do not operate as intended, whether because of poor legislation, poor administration, or the use of too much fertilizer.

The success of some farm programs, such as in the case of sugar and tobacco, in terms of controlling production in line with consumption, maintaining farm income, providing a stable supply at a fair price for consumers, and causing no expense to the Treasury, gives encouragement to some farmers and others interested in agriculture to seek Government assistance programs to help deal with the problems of marketing an oversupply of a commodity such as wheat in a sensitive market in which prices can tumble overnight below the farmer's cost of production.

There is almost unanimous hope among farmers and nonfarmers alike that a transition period is in sight that will lead American agriculture back to the free market system and minimum Government intervention and cost. H.R. 11222 is a step in this direction, because it will definitely reduce surplus stocks and prevent further surplus accumulation of wheat and feed grains.

#### SECOND TOWN TALK EDITORIAL

My hometown newspaper, the Alexandria Daily Town Talk, on May 12, 1962, took issue with my committee position on the farm bill in the following editorial:

#### McSWEEN'S ONE BIG VOTE

Representative HAROLD B. McSWEEN, who has been resisting pressure and voting with the conservatives ever since he went to Washington, cast the biggest vote of his congressional career this week—the wrong way.

It was Mr. McSWEEN's vote which cleared the administration's farm bill in the House Agriculture Committee on Thursday. The vote was 18 to 17, and that 1 vote means the objectionable bill will be debated on the floor of the House, where support is considerable.

Mr. McSWEEN had said he would vote for the bill in committee, reserving the right to vote against it in the House unless it was amended to remove objectionable provisions.

But Mr. McSWEEN must have known that committee action was the key. One vote will not decide the issue on the floor, no matter which way the decision goes.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman was on solid ground when he said the bill had cleared

its first "and perhaps most difficult" hurdle by winning committee approval.

And Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the committee, also was speaking from facts when he predicted the House would pass the bill "substantially in its present form."

Also right was Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Republican, of Iowa, who said the bill would "almost make it necessary for a farmer to procure a Federal license to operate his farm."

The bill, characteristic of the New Frontier, is loaded down with objectionable features. It extends Federal control over the few phases of agriculture which had escaped the bureaucratic tentacles. It removes the last vestiges of individual choice from agriculture. It will make worse an already intolerable situation.

Mr. McSWEEN may feel that in dollars and cents passage of the farm bill means virtually nothing one way or another to the Eighth District. And he may have secured concessions on other matters that do mean something to his district.

But from a standpoint of principle, he should be filled with remorse.

#### FIRST TOWN TALK EDITORIAL

This definite indictment of the bill under consideration, because it has kinship with the "New Frontier," appeared about 3 months after a previous editorial of February 2, 1962, in the same newspaper as follows:

#### THE NEW FARM PROPOSALS

Congressional reaction to President Kennedy's 1962 farm program, submitted on Wednesday, has been just about as expected. But congressional reaction is important only in that it is a gauge to the program's reception in Congress.

What is important is the reaction of the farmers themselves, and this is certain to be violent in some quarters.

From an impartial vantage point, Mr. Kennedy's proposals must be considered as good and bad, both to extremes.

It is certainly undesirable to dump surpluses on the market at will, as he proposes to do, because of the depressing effects on the prices farmers would receive for their crops.

But the proposal which is expected to draw the sharpest fire from the bulk of the Nation's farmers is that which would cut off all Government subsidies to farmers who refuse to go along with Government acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

For the good of the whole country, however, we must try such a program sooner or later. It doesn't make sense to continue pouring billions of tax dollars into price supports, soil-bank payments, et cetera, if these practices do not help to cut the surpluses which cost the taxpayers other billions.

Most farmers, bless them, still want to return to the law of supply and demand; they are willing to suffer the lean years that would mark the beginning of such an elemental system.

But until their wisdom is matched in Washington, we must expect the Nation as a whole will have to continue to subsidize agriculture. Hence, it is expedient to tie such subsidization to programs which will gradually alleviate the tax burden and aim at a return to uncontrolled production.

Because of their efficiency and the gains in technology, American farmers continue to produce more each year in spite of the best efforts of Government to reduce production. It is obvious to the most naive among us, then, that continuation of past programs of acreage controls and marketing quotas and price supports will do nothing to solve the "farm problem."

Mr. Kennedy's 1962 proposals may also fall short of their objectives, but the question

that must be resolved is whether they should not be tried in view of the failure of programs now in operation.

#### SENATOR BYRD SUPPORTED FEED GRAIN PROVISION

Mr. Speaker, I think that most persons will agree with me that there are sharp inconsistencies in these two editorials that leave a reader confused as to the farm policy of this newspaper, which serves an important farm area. Let us consider the claims made in the latest editorial in the *Town Talk*. First, there is the implication that my committee position is not conservative. I always believe that I am on sound ground whenever I try to reduce Federal spending. I believe that it is conservative and desirable to try to stop the costly accumulation of farm surpluses and to reduce the stocks on hand, thereby recovering a portion of the cost of these commodities. I regret to see anyone defend the continuation of costly surplus accumulation in the name of conservatism. I noticed with interest that Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, an acknowledged conservative, voted in the Senate on May 24 for the Ellender amendment which put the feed grain section that is contained in the House bill back in the Senate bill on the floor of the Senate.

The *Town Talk* also claims that this bill "extends Federal control over the few phases of agriculture which had escaped the bureaucratic tentacles" and that "it removes the last vestiges of individual choice from agriculture." These claims are incorrect. As I shall point out in detail no new Federal control of any kind can result from this bill except by approval of two-thirds of the farmers concerned, and this applies only to feed grains. Otherwise there is no extension of any control to any phase of agriculture.

#### MORNING ADVOCATE EDITORIAL

By contrast here is a less emotional and more factual editorial from the May 31 issue of the *Baton Rouge Morning Advocate*:

#### THE NEW FARM BILL

If the debate over the administration farm bill begins to sound a little like the same old record, that's because it is the same old record. Many of the more important changes first sought by the administration, whether good changes or bad, have been knocked out of the bill or abandoned by the administration in an effort to get some kind of legislation through Congress. The bill as it now stands continues the farm program in pretty much reducing surpluses of wheat, corn, and other feed grains, and relatively high price supports.

Opponents of the Federal farm programs fight it tooth and nail, as the saying goes. When farmers are called on to vote on the choice of strict controls and high price supports, as opposed to greatly relaxed controls and much lower price supports, or none, they will vote for the first, as in the past. Certainly, many would like to find some way out of the present situation of surpluses, acreage controls and price supports, but the way has not yet been found.

Halfway measure of easing controls and simultaneously lowering price supports have failed, partly because of political pressure to set supports at too high a level. The result has been something close to the economic impossibility of price supports on unlimited production. The "cold turkey" remedy of throwing out supports and con-

trols and letting supply and demand have its way is always open, but so drastic a remedy is feared by almost everyone concerned.

The most significant features of the new farm bill is the application to wheat, corn, and other feed grains of more strict controls similar to those that have been in effect on cotton, tobacco, and peanuts. The control and support programs applied to the last three crops have not worked perfectly and have been rather expensive. But it is true that the cotton surplus, especially, has been reduced through these and other measures, while the halfway control plans applied to feed grains were encouraging production of colossal surpluses.

These immense surpluses of feed grains are responsible for development of the fantastic grain storage business in which Billie Sol Estes dabbled with such great though temporary success.

Meanwhile, the rapid growth of hunger in China and the reduction of surplus of food stores in other parts of the world, outside the United States, remind us that under some circumstances our own food stocks could become one of our greatest assets. The value of the world's last great stock of surplus grain could not be estimated in dollars.

Farmers in my district and I have kept in close touch on this bill, just as we do on all legislation affecting persons who live in rural areas. The dairy farmers told me that they were opposed to marketing allotments for milk, and we took this control feature out of the dairy section of the bill in committee. The entire dairy section will be removed by floor action as I have previously mentioned.

#### PROVISIONS OF FEED GRAIN SECTION

The remaining concern of farmers in my district has been over the feed grain section, under the provisions of which marketing quotas for feed grains could be approved by a vote of two-thirds of the eligible feed grain farmers in a referendum. The terms of the referendum are subject to some justifiable criticism. Feed grain farmers would have two choices: either a program providing for acreage allotments coupled with price supports; or no program—no controls and no price supports. This would be a fair choice for farmers as between controls and freedom. There is a valid question, however, with regard to the provision which permits the release into the market for unrestricted use of up to 10 million tons of surplus feed grains. Farmers correctly fear that this authority could be used to adversely affect the market price of feed grains, thus preventing a fair choice in the referendum. This provision needs to be amended to sufficiently restrict the authority to release surplus stocks under these circumstances and thereby offer to feed grain farmers a fair choice between controls on one hand and freedom on the other hand. I shall offer such an amendment, which will probably be accepted without serious argument. Such a provision was incorporated in the bill passed by the Senate May 25.

A continuation of the expensive emergency feed grain legislation applicable to the 1961 and 1962 crops, which cost \$782 million in 1961 and which is expected to cost \$900 million in 1962 cannot be justified. Neither can we justify a return to the existing permanent legislation which

was enacted in 1958 and which was a sequel to the 1956 Soil Bank Act. These open-end programs of unlimited production coupled with price supports do not work. They have caused the accumulation of an additional \$2 billion in surplus feed-grain stocks since their enactment. Yet the Farm Bureau wants us either to extend the expensive emergency feed-grain program or revert to the 1958 permanent legislation. Farmers have no right to expect the taxpayers to provide price supports unless production is kept in line with consumption, and the rank-and-file farmer does not ask the taxpayers to do this.

The peak accumulation of 75 million tons of feed grains has been reduced to 67 million tons since the enactment in 1961 of the emergency program. The proposed feed grain program is designed to reduce surplus stocks to desirable levels—between 30 and 50 million tons—in about 5 years. Harvested acreages of the four major feed grains would probably be 10 to 20 percent below 1959-60 acreages for several years. Under the proposed program livestock prices can be maintained at levels materially higher than if the pre-1961 program were continued and far above levels expected if feed grain production were unrestricted with price supports at market levels. With feed-grain production stabilized, the output of meat animals can be increased substantially in response to increased demands for meat and livestock products, while prices received by producers of cattle, hogs, and poultry will be stabilized and prevented from collapsing along with the prices of feed grains.

#### MIDWEST WOULD LOSE BONANZA

The storm center of opposition to this bill is the Midwest—the Corn Belt which has been smart enough and politically strong enough over the years to get price supports for corn with unlimited production. They have been able to have their cake and eat it too. The corn and storage business in the Midwest is booming at the taxpayer's expense. The recent publicity about grain storage is not the first storage problem arising out of the excesses of existing law. I do not blame the Midwest for resisting this bill. Under the feed grain referendum the Midwest would lose its bonanza, because it must either accept controls or lose supports. It is questionable, however, whether paid Farm Bureau lobbyists in Louisiana are representing the best interests of Louisiana farmers when they help the Midwest to fight its battles. It is wrong for farm organizations to make deals at the national level and then try to indoctrinate Louisiana farmers down at the grassroots with these policies with propaganda ironically paid for by Louisiana farmers.

The Midwest has even been able to enlist the support of some cattlemen in other parts of the Nation to help it to hold on to this gravy train. The argument is advanced to cattlemen that "if they control corn they will eventually control cattle." This fear argument does not hold water. As long as cattlemen continue to have no interest in securing price supports for cattle they need not fear the adoption of controls. The argu-

ment is also advanced that "if they control corn there will not be enough feed for cattle." About the same time it is argued that if the 67 million tons of surplus feed grain stocks worth \$3 billion are allowed to gradually move into the market to prevent spoiling—it can be stored only about 8 years before spoiling—and to keep it from being a total loss to the Treasury the market price of feed grains will be depressed, causing also a drop in cattle and land prices. The person making these arguments meets himself coming and going. Certainly there can be no shortage of feed grains for cattle in view of these large surplus stocks and in view of the remarkable increases in production yields.

Also stability in feed grain and cattle prices is more likely to be maintained in the long run if surplus stocks are reduced in orderly fashion to desired levels.

#### EFFECT IN LOUISIANA

In Louisiana the argument has also been made that a mandatory feed grain program, if adopted by farmers in the referendum, would inhibit the growth and diversification of Louisiana agriculture, particularly since Louisiana is a deficit feed grain State, and that Louisiana would not be free to increase its feed grain production as it wishes. This is also a misleading argument. Corn specialists in Louisiana tell me that more corn would be grown in Louisiana under such a program than under the continuation of the present emergency legislation and that the downward trend in Louisiana corn production would be arrested. Louisiana corn production has decreased in the last decade, mainly because of the trend toward using former corn acreage for pasture for grazing beef cattle. This downward trend in Louisiana corn production occurred during years of complete freedom of farmers to use their land without controls on feed grains. In 1960 Louisiana produced only 13 million bushels of corn while consuming approximately 50 million bushels. To meet its own present demands Louisiana would need to plant an additional 680,000 acres to corn. Instead of planting more corn Louisiana farmers are electing to grow less corn and graze more cattle, because cattle are more profitable than corn in Louisiana, and often they find it is cheaper to buy corn than grow it.

Under the provisions of the Grant deficit area amendment, Louisiana and most other Southeastern States that are deficit in feed grain production would probably be exempt from the general provisions of the control program, and producers would be able to plant their entire base acreage if desired.

The provisions of the McSween amendment applying the principle of release and reapportionment of feed grain acres would assure commercial feed grain farmers that they could increase their acreages in the years ahead, just as have cotton farmers who have desired increased allotments.

#### 25-ACRE EXEMPTION

Another important provision of the feed grain section exempts farms with a feed grain base of less than 25 acres;

86 percent of the feed grain producers in Louisiana would fall in this category. These provisions coupled with diversion payments in lower amounts than under the existing emergency legislation insure that feed grain production in Louisiana would increase by more than 15 percent under such a program over 1962.

In view of these provisions it is easy to see that Louisiana critics of H.R. 11222, mainly paid lobbyists, are still seeing ghosts even though all of the bugaboos have been run away.

In Louisiana most cotton farmers support the cotton program of controls and price supports. The same is true for rice and sugar growers with regard to the rice and sugar program. Yet some of these same persons are still holding out for the same costly open end surplus-creating feed grain program that has caused so much trouble. Only they can explain their reason for this inconsistency.

Mr. Speaker, farm bills did not win any popularity contests under the Eisenhower administration, and they are not crowd pleasers now. But Congress has the responsibility to do something now about this serious matter. It is a national problem and the concern of every American. Considering the good work done in the Agriculture Committee to improve this bill and the likelihood of further perfecting it on the House floor as I have mentioned, I think that this farm bill will serve well the Nation and my State of Louisiana, farmers and non-farmers alike.

#### THE 171ST ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S CONSTITUTION

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, annual observances, commemorating the 171st anniversary of Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791, were held at Polish Cadets' Hall, Buffalo, N.Y., on May 3, 1962; at Dom Polski Hall, Buffalo, N.Y., on May 6, 1962; at Dom Polski Hall, North Tonawanda, N.Y., on May 6, 1962. I am glad to place in the RECORD the resolution which was unanimously adopted.

The resolution follows:

Whereas Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791, the first liberal European constitution, symbolized the aspirations of Polish-speaking people to freedom and equality; and

Whereas said constitution, documenting man's respect for the dignity of individuals, is equally symbolic today of the same desires of all human beings; and

Whereas the United States of America, the chief bastion of freedom in the world, is the main repository of the hopes of humanity for a future bereft of oppression; and

Whereas in Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791, as in the Constitution of the United States of America, the rights of an individual are declared to be paramount to the interests of the State; and

Whereas the security of the American way of life is being threatened by forces of a system in which the interests of the State are supreme; Be it therefore

Resolved, That we pledge our support to the President of the United States of America, John F. Kennedy, in actions undertaken by him to strengthen the military position of our Nation. We support his decision to renew nuclear weapon testing in order to maintain the lead of our Nation in this respect, and we unite with the President in all endeavors to make this a world governed by the rule of law and reason rather than by violence and oppression; and be it further

Resolved, That we unequivocally declare opposition to "isms" prevalent in the world which would deny man his basic, inalienable rights and which would debase his God-given dignity; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States of America must maintain strong ties with its historically trusted allies, and to this end we feel that economic aid to Poland must be stepped up to bolster the will of the Polish people in their resistance to Communist rule; we ask that the Battle Act, which limits aid to Poland, be amended so that loans and grants for industrial development can be advanced to that nation, mindful that heretofore American aid has been in the form of agricultural surpluses only, all other aid being barred by the aforesaid Battle Act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President John F. Kennedy, to our New York State Senators, Hon. Jacob Javits, Hon. Kenneth Keating, and to our area Congressmen, Hon. Thaddeus Dulski, Hon. William E. Miller, and Hon. John Pillion.

#### MERGER OF PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD AND NEW YORK CENTRAL RAILROAD

Mr. DJLSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a petition which the Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, intervening in the proceeding before the Commission in the matter of the proposed merger of the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads. The petition follows:

PETITION OF TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO, FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE—BEFORE THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

(In the matter of the application of Pennsylvania Railroad to seek authority to merge properties and franchises of New York Central Railroad)

(Finance Docket No. 21989)

Comes now the petitioner, Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, and respectfully represents that it has an interest in the matters in controversy in the above-entitled proceeding, that it desires to intervene in and become a party to said proceeding, and for grounds in support of said petition, respectfully shows:

I

The petitioner, Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, is a labor organization with approximately 150,000 dues-paying members. This international union has a subordinate known as the Railroad Division with 20,000 members of whom 16,500 are employed on the Pennsylvania Railroad, 200 employed on harbor tugboats of the New

York Central Railroad and 400 employed by the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie, a New York Central subsidiary. Apart from this, a substantial number of the 150,000 members of the petitioner are directly interested as users of the freight and passenger services of the carriers here involved.

The principal office of the petitioner is at 210 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

## II

The petitioner is in collective bargaining relationship with both of the carriers here involved with respect to its members employed by them and has agreements concerning seniority, rates of pay, rules, and working conditions.

## III

This application falls within the provisions of section 5(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act and the proposed transaction by reason of section 5(2)(f) of the act directly involves the petitioner's members. The evidence that will be presented will bear seriously and substantially on the possible adverse effect on the carriers' employees who are members of the petitioner should the proposed transaction be approved by the Commission. In this respect, the petitioner has a direct and substantial interest in any terms and conditions which parties to the proceeding may propose with respect to the protection of employees' interests and it may well itself propose terms and conditions if the application should be granted in other respects.

## IV

By reason of the fact that many of the petitioner's members are users of the passenger and freight facilities of the roads, they are, moreover, seriously concerned with the merits of the petition in other respects and desire an opportunity to be heard with respect to them. The economic aspects of the proposed merger are ominous and require a full and fair hearing with presentation of certain points of view which are ignored in the application by the carriers. That application is devoted and directed solely to the question of increasing profit and decreasing cost of operation of the railroads themselves. The public interest requires consideration of the consequences for the economy and for the national defense of many aspects of the proposed merger. Examples of such aspects are:

(a) The piecemeal approach involved in the merger of these two particular roads and possible conflict of this isolated merger with the national program for an integrated merger policy as set forth in the message of the President of the United States on the subject.

(b) The dismantling of a plant and facility, essential to national defense, that cannot be readily reconstructed.

(c) The implication with respect to the antitrust laws and antimonopoly policy.

(d) Its importance as a precedent for other proposed and pending mergers.

(e) The reduction of available alternatives for shippers.

(f) Effect of the merger on the economic problems of communities where the carriers now have separate facilities.

(g) Other economic aspects, such as disregard of possibility of increasing rail traffic and revenues by increasing use of railroad facilities.

## V

The intervention of this petitioner will not broaden the issues already before the Commission in this proceeding.

Wherefore, the petitioner, in its own behalf, and in behalf of the individual members of such organization, prays leave to intervene in this cause and be treated as party hereto with the right to have notice of and participate in any further proceedings, to appear thereat, to present testimony,

to produce and examine witnesses, and to be heard by counsel upon brief or oral argument.

Respectfully submitted.

O'DWYER & BERNSTEIN,

Attorneys for Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO.

(Of counsel: Paul O'Dwyer and Howard N. Meyer, New York, N.Y.)

MAY 3, 1962.

**ON THE QUESTION OF WHY WE HAVE HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT, UNUSED PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY, AND A SLOW RATE GROWTH WHILE THE ECONOMIES OF MANY COUNTRIES OF WESTERN EUROPE CONTINUE BOOMING—THE UNRESOLVED DILEMMA OF TIGHT MONEY AND HIGH INTEREST VERSUS FEDERAL DEFICITS, AND THE CONTINUING CONTROVERSY OVER INSUFFICIENT CONSUMER DEMAND VERSUS AN INSUFFICIENT BUSINESS SHARE OF THE NATIONAL INCOME**

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an editorial entitled "European Success Formula," addressed to a question of what roles the budgets of the governments of Western Europe have played in the continuing prosperity of most of those countries. This editorial refers to the last annual report of the Joint Economic Committee and suggests that the committee report has answered this question erroneously, though in truth the committee's report did not answer this question at all, and did not try to.

I mention this matter not in the spirit of making a complaint. Since the Post was referring to a report of the majority members of the committee—one not agreed to by the minority members—I suppose we could charitably apply an old saying among Democrats, that "a bad press mention is better than no press mention at all." I have no doubt that the Post's mistreatment of our report was by inadvertence, and I rather imagine that the editorial writer had read the report so long ago that he had forgotten what was in it.

Since we were not being political in this report, however, in any partisan sense of the term, I would not like any Member left with an impression that the committee's report deals with something it does not deal with. Accordingly, I will insert in the RECORD the Post editorial along with a letter I have written to the editor concerning this matter.

It is true that President Kennedy has suggested that it would be well to try to find out what accounts for the difference in the way our economy is performing and the booming business conditions in Western Europe. It is a good question,

and I wish we had the answer to it—but we do not. Perhaps we will have soon.

The President suggested this question specifically to the CED, I believe, and the top brass of the CED is, I understand, in Europe now to make a prompt study of the question. No doubt within a week or so we will have a rather precise prescription as to what the Federal Government should do, by way of holding down wages, increasing business profits, reducing corporate taxes, speeding up depreciation allowances, cutting taxes on top bracket personal incomes and providing other bases for an increase in business confidence and management incentives calculated as necessary to put the unemployed back to work and stimulate economic growth.

Meanwhile, we are faced with some dilemmas and knotty controversies. There is a question of which policy instruments to use to stimulate economic activity. If our Federal Reserve authorities could, and would, permit a more rapid growth of our money supply, permitting also a decline in interest rates, we would normally expect a return to full employment. Such a monetary policy would allow the private economy to expand and take up the existing slack. But our policymakers find obstacles to what would normally be a proper monetary policy, because of our balance-of-payments problem. They feel that if they allowed the money supply to grow more rapidly, and thus allowed interest rates to come down, there would be more borrowing from U.S. banks and capital markets by foreign nations and governments, and this would increase the dollar claims held abroad which could be used to purchase our gold reserves.

The administration has not thought it appropriate to suggest any steps to discourage our people from investing abroad in new plants or in foreign bonds and stocks, nor to discourage foreign governments and nationals from raising funds in the United States, and such fund raising here is a common practice.

For example, this morning's Washington Post carries an advertisement by a U.S. underwriting firm offering American investors additional shares of common stock in Philips N.V. This is a Netherlands corporation which operates throughout Western Europe and occupies about the same position there that General Electric does in the United States. The magazine of Wall Street, in its June 2 issue, offers a comment that the foreign governments and international agencies have raised more money in the United States this year than in any calendar year since 1958, and more borrowing is yet to come. Without some arrangement for selective controls, or selective disincentives or penalties—which has not been suggested—our monetary authorities doubtless feel justified in continuing their tight-money and high-interest policy because an easier money policy might encourage even more foreign fundraising in the United States.

Assuming that the Federal Reserve cannot adopt a monetary policy appropriate to our domestic needs, a policy of letting the money supply increase right

JUNE 2, 1962.

along with increases in economic activity, then the alternative way of stimulating economic activity is to have bigger Federal deficits. But this is no easy solution either. As we well know, Federal deficits are fraught with all kinds of dangers, both economic and political.

If there were to be a deliberate decision to have a larger Federal deficit, we would be immediately up against a question whether to cut taxes without cutting expenditures, or to increase spending for some of the worthy purposes which various segments of public opinion hold dear, while maintaining the present level of taxes.

Furthermore, if there were to be a decision to cut taxes, then we would still have the controversy over whether the tax relief should go to consumers or to business. Here is a basic question which has not been answered:

Given the peculiar conditions of the U.S. economy, what division of the national income as between consumers and business would bring about a continuing increase in employment and production—and thus a larger income to be divided?

One school of thought holds that our present problem comes about because of insufficient consumer purchasing power. This school argues that if consumers received a larger share of present income, the resulting increase in consumer demand would bring about increased employment, increased utilization of productive capacity, larger aggregate business profits, and, finally, an incentive for business to invest in new capacity.

The other school holds that if relatively more of the present income were allowed to go into return on capital, either in the form of increased depreciation or increased profits after taxes, then business would have more incentive to invest, more funds to invest, and the slack in our economy would be taken up by building new productive capacity.

The Washington Post is clearly on the side of more incentives to business and has been plumping for a kit of such incentives for several months now. There is a most interesting piece by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., in the New York Times this morning, however, which gives a round-up of European views on this subject. I would like to call this piece to the Members' attention also.

Finally, the Washington Post editorial refers to an article which appeared in the London Economist of May 19, by an observer of the European economy who claims that the European governments have been living in both kinds of economic sin—allowing their money supply to increase and also having Government deficits. This is most interesting, if true.

Monetary authorities in the United States have, for at least 15 years now, been shrinking our money supply relative to our gross national product, pulling the checkreins tighter and tighter, and holding private economic activity further and further away from achieving its potential. For the most part the governments of Western Europe have, according to the Economist, been allowing their money supplies to increase

about in proportion to increases in their gross national products. Most interesting, I hope we can get the facts on this matter, perhaps through the Federal Reserve, even without sending a mission to Europe for them.

Also, it will be most interesting to get the facts on the European budgets.

It appears that if you count only the budgets of the central governments, these governments have had many sizable deficits over the past decade or more. On the other hand, if you also count the budgets of the local governmental units, it appears, according to the Washington Post, that the countries of Western Europe have generally not had deficits. This needs looking into, also; it may throw some light on the President's question.

The materials I have referred to are as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 2, 1962]

#### EUROPEAN SUCCESS FORMULA

The President has asked his advisers to study the policies of European countries to discover how most of them have managed to grow so rapidly. Some observers have cited the alleged European tendency to run budget deficits as a principal reason. The annual report of the congressional Joint Economic Committee has pointed out that, by American accounting standards, the governments of a number of European countries are usually in deficit. The London Economist has said that "deficits pay" and urged the United States to learn the lesson.

Data supplied by the Statistical Office of the Common Market seem at odds with these views. In its bulletin, the Statistical Office computes the aggregate financial position of the national and local governments for each of the six member countries, in terms of their national income accounts. The only country showing fairly steady deficits is Belgium, which is also the only country whose growth has been notably slow. All the others show almost uninterrupted surpluses for every year from 1950 to 1959, the period covered by the data. This is true even for France, despite her inflationary policies during the pre-De Gaulle years. The surpluses were of respectable size, in the case of Gaullist France as much as 2 percent of gross national product, in that of Germany as much as 5 percent. These surpluses helped to restrain inflation and in part were channeled into the private economies where they served to speed up investment and increase the rate of growth.

A similar correction must be applied to the revised European budgets quoted in the report of the Joint Economic Committee. The committee's data no doubt are correct, as far as they go, but they do not tell the whole story, because they omit the budgets of local authorities. For Germany, for instance, the monthly report of the federal bank shows that occasional deficits of the central government tend to be outweighed by surpluses achieved at other levels of government. In the United States, on the other hand, State and local authorities produce deficits year after year. These must be added to the Federal accounts to get a true picture of the financial role of government.

The issue is not whether public deficits are inherently good or bad. In a stagnant economy, a deficit is appropriate. It is quite possible that in recessions the European countries would run deficits and act less defensively about them than is customary here. But a vigorous economy will grow faster if it has a surplus. The continental countries have operated by this principle, and on the evidence very successfully.

The Editor,  
*The Washington Post and Times Herald,*  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am puzzled as to why your editorial page, after being silent on the Joint Economic Committee's annual report for 3 months following its issuance, would now represent this report as giving the wrong answer to a question which the report neither raises nor attempts to answer.

In your editorial "European Success Formula" on June 2, you mix the committee's report into a question which has been more recently raised, namely, what role the budgets of Western European governments may have played in the high employment and rapid growth rates recently experienced by a number of these countries, and you reach the conclusion that the report gives the wrong answer because it uses the wrong data—"a similar correction must be applied to the revised European budgets quoted in the report of the Joint Economic Committee."

True, the report makes reference, at two places, to the fact that several central governments of Western Europe have had deficits in their budgets in a number of the past 10 years, but these references go to those issues discussed at the points where the references are made.

First, in discussing improvements recently made in Federal accounting practices, the report discusses possible further improvements, including a capital budget. The practice of treating investments in capital items as "expenses" of the year in which the outlays are made is unique with Federal accounting, and a comment is made that European budgets would show deficits more frequently if they followed Federal accounting practices.

Second, the report makes a point that the advice which Congress has long been receiving from European officials and bankers, usually through the voices of our own Treasury and Federal Reserve officials, which would have us believe that any Federal deficit, under any circumstances, undermines European confidence in the dollar may be advice of an unwarranted sort. Here the report presents data (supplied by the Bureau of the Budget) showing the net surpluses or deficits in several European budgets over a 10-year period, after the European budgets are translated to terms comparable with those of the Federal budget. On this basis the budgets of several European countries which have generally been thought to have been in surplus over the past decade turn out to have been in deficit more often than has the Federal budget. Thus it may be that the nervousness which our European friends are said to suffer over Federal deficits is traceable to a difference in form rather than a difference in substance. In any case, it is the Federal administrative budget, not the income and product accounts budget, which has been the cause of the alleged nervousness.

If the report had intended to go beyond the points discussed and suggest some connection between European budgets and growth rates, then some analysis, some mention of growth rates, some presentation of data on the subject—of which there is none—would be expected, indeed, required. A congressional committee could not get away with the kind of analysis engaged in in your editorial, wherein you conclude that "a vigorous economy will grow faster if it has a surplus," merely because you find that the only European country "showing fairly steady deficits" has had a "notably slow" growth rate.

A full chapter of the committee's report is devoted to a discussion of the meaning and uses of the different Federal budgets, and this discussion emphasizes that in considering such questions as what influence Federal fiscal operations may have on the

economy, we must consider total expenditures and revenue collections as measured by the product and income account budget, not just the fraction of this picture that is presented in the administrative budget. Accordingly, the report's failure to present data for European budgets in terms of income and product accounts does not mean that our data need correction. It only means that we need a correction of your unwarranted assumption that the report addresses itself to a question of relationships between European budgets and growth rates.

Granted, the question is a good one, but to answer it, as you have attempted to do, would require a great deal more information than has been referred to in your editorial.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

[From the London Economist, May 19, 1962]

#### DEFICITS PAY

There must be an American somewhere—and a place surely exists for him on the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal—who can contrive to demonstrate that the economic performance of the United States in the past 5 or 6 years has been better than that of Western Europe. As the medieval metaphysicians showed, a properly armed theoretician can prove anything and economic theory is most rewarding in this respect. At the very least, such an American should be able to argue convincingly that the continental Europeans, who have clearly done everything wrong, are headed for grave trouble in the long run—even though they may have been growing faster, investing more, making more profits, raising wages and living standards faster, avoiding recessions and maintaining full employment up to now.

By all the truths Americans have lived by, the continental Europeans must be in for dire trouble. Their economic sins are almost unspeakable. First, and by all odds foremost, their governments never balance their budgets—at least as Americans understand the term. More awful still, they do their best to avoid surpluses in these budgets. All of them have some nationalized industries; not one, for example, has that pillar of free enterprise, a privately owned railway system. Almost without exception, they take more from their people in all forms of taxation than does the United States; yet, unaccountably, incentives have not been dulled and risk capital has not dried up. Government spending in European countries rises giddily year after year, much faster than in the United States, and the welfare state knows no bounds. Most subversive of all, Europeans have been living in sin with creeping inflation for 10 years, with hardly a dire consequence to show for it. They are virtuous enough to say that they hate themselves for doing it but they do it and nothing much happens.

It is clearly an unjust world that permits such economic sinners to go on getting richer and richer and at the same time permits them to take away nearly a billion dollars worth of American gold each year. The continental Europeans, in fact, are doing in economics what any sensible man knows is impossible: they are spending themselves rich. Unfortunately, all this has gone on with such good results for so long that the painful question arises of whether virtue and sin have not changed places. In the long run Europe may be doomed to suffer, but the long run seems to fade further and further into the distance. Europe is now in its fourth consecutive year without the shadow of a recession and looks like repealing the business cycle altogether. What moral does this hold for America?

The first thing is to decide which economic transgression has been most effective. Many of the people who have come to admire the

profligate way of life in Europe have centered their gaze on a number of small things instead of on the essential big one. There has been study and approval of such factors as Monnet-type national planning, a heavy concentration on indirect taxes in the "mix" of taxation and the aggressive use of rapid depreciation allowances for industry. These are all no doubt important and useful. But the one big reason for continental Europe's success story is the way government policy has affected total demand. By avoiding surpluses in their budgets by means of rapid rises in spending and occasional cuts in taxes, by keeping the supply of money expanding constantly, European governments have given Keynes in heaven (or at least in purgatory) the satisfaction of having been right. They have shown that a fiscal and monetary policy aimed, above all things, at high demand—when necessary created through bigger budgetary deficits and never curtailed by surpluses—is the way to make an advanced economy work well.

Between 1941 and 1953, when Americans, wringing their hands over the awful things which they were doing, had big and purposeful deficits and a steadily expanding supply of money, they also had a successful economy. Of all the old days, the most pleasant to contemplate are those only a dozen years ago when it was generally hard to find labor in America—and those days saw the country automating considerably faster than it is doing now, measured by the rate of investment in plant and equipment as a portion of total activity. Nor is there any need to go to war to practice the sin of spending yourself rich. Building schools, for example, does just as well.

In 1953 Americans returned to the path of virtue and a policy of holding back demand by curbing the rise in Government spending and making money scarce. There was a vast sigh of relief that sanity had come back. But by about 1957, plainly things began to go sour. Ever since then, Americans have been telling themselves all the wrong reasons why the economy has been working badly and growing slowly. They have ended by doing slightly better than the profligates across the Atlantic in the battle against the dragon inflation, but it is doubtful whether the spiritual comfort of this victory compensates the 4 million unemployed in America for the loss of the more crass pleasure of having enough to eat.

The conclusion to be drawn is that the American Government should also try to spend its country rich. This means setting out aggressively to create, and then to maintain, a rapidly rising aggregate of demands.

Probably the goal of surpluses in the budget should be dropped for good. A deficit of \$5 or \$6 billion in the forthcoming fiscal year should invigorate a recovering but still underemployed economy—always provided that the deficit is brought about intentionally by higher spending or a tax cut and not inadvertently through the failure of a sluggish economy to produce the expected receipts from taxes. To be successful, one must sin with a certain style. The tragedy of the recent American deficits is that they were unwanted and thus did not stimulate the economy very much.

But the economic Puritans will ask: What about the balance of international payments? The answer is that the American balance of payments abroad fares better when the American economy at home fares better. With the exception of France, which for a while overdid sin and inflated right out of sight, the same has been true for Europe; and now France, back to mere creeping inflation, is doing best of all. There is, in short, no evidence that a payments deficit is increased necessarily by full employment and rapid growth and they may easily reduce it. As for confidence the only real attack on the dollar occurred late in 1960 when

the United States was heading into the most recent recession in its dreary series. Some European bankers may shake their heads about budgetary deficits in America, but these do not deter them from investing on Wall Street when the stock market looks good.

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1962]

EUROPEANS SEE BENEFIT FOR UNITED STATES IN EXPANSIONIST ECONOMIC POLICY—DEFICIT SPENDING AND EASY-MONEY PLAN VIEWED AS SPUR TO BUSINESS—SOME EXPERTS FEAR NEW GOLD OUTFLOW

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Commentators differ about what should be given priority—growth and full employment or preserving the value of the dollar. Some, such as the respected French economist and political commentator Raymond Aron, believe the two can be reconciled. But something of a dilemma is seen almost everywhere.

Regardless of what is prescribed, there is evidently a strongly held opinion that if the stock market continues weak, business fails to expand and unemployment remains high in the United States, the administration will choose policies of expansion, taking the risk of further trouble for the dollar.

This belief helped account for the sharp drop in the dollar against several European currencies in the foreign exchange markets for a few days last week and a sizable increase in the demand for gold on the London market.

Probably the most authoritative consensus in Europe is contained in a still-confidential document unanimously adopted recently by the 20 member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, each represented by high officials or economists.

This referred not to recent events but to the lagging growth record of the United States in the last half of the last decade, although the problem is the same. It concluded that the difficulty in the United States was due to insufficient pressure of demand.

It said the level of demand is within the control of governments, through their budget and monetary policies, at least in the larger countries.

But it also remarked that the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments "might have created difficulties" if the Government had chosen to adopt a policy of expanding domestic demand through higher Government spending or tax cuts.

Reflective of the underlying views of economic commentators in Europe are the following:

Samuel Brittan, in today's Observer, of London:

"The important thing is to get the U.S. budget into a sufficiently large deficit."

He says the dollar's value may be maintained for a long time by new techniques of international cooperation, and that in any case a far more important issue is avoiding the tragic farce of unemployment "side by side with unsatisfied human wants."

Raymond Aron, in Friday's Figaro:

"Perhaps, and I am tempted to believe it, businessmen have false ideas and may fear measures that they ought to be calling for. A budget deficit, in bringing about an acceleration of the expansion, could contribute to the stabilization of, and not to the dangers for, the dollar.

"It is possible that in our epoch expansion may be an element even in the struggle against inflation.

"But the Kennedy team not only has not resolved the two great problems which it must face up to—that of the rate of growth and that of the solidity of the dollar—but it does not give the impression of having a doctrine by which it could try to resolve them."

A Zurich banker:  
"Your administration has not realized how fragile a thing confidence is. The recovery on Wall Street after Monday has not healed the wounds."

"I am not asking for a big budget deficit, but I am asking for more recognition of the damage that can be done by ignoring or glossing over what has been going on."

One element of this view—that the damage will not be transitory—appears to be widespread.

For example, William Res-Mogg, in the conservative Sunday Times, of London said:

"Big government spending and deficit budgets would cheer up Wall Street at the expense of the dollar and the gold reserves. Last Monday's Wall Street selling should certainly remind policymakers in Washington that if they are not going to raise the price of gold they cannot in the present situation merely do nothing."

The leading headline and main story on the first page of *Le Soir*, of Brussels, on Tuesday: "The collapse in Wall Street does not mean another 1929."

This view appears to be close to unanimous.

#### DUTCH OFFICIAL'S OPINION

A high Dutch official:

"Your problem is not budget deficits, but in present circumstances. Your problem is your wage levels and your overall costs—though we in Europe seem to be catching up to you almost too rapidly for our own good."

A minority of economists, such as Sir Roy Harrod of Oxford University, have advocated for a long time that the way out of the dilemma between full employment and the balance-of-payments deficit in the United States was to devalue the dollar once and for all by a large increase in the gold price.

Central bankers and finance ministers, however, appear to be firmly convinced that such a move would be disastrous for the monetary system of the whole industrialized world.

Furthermore, in holding dollars as part of the monetary reserves of their countries, they relied on the pledge of successive U.S. administrations that the dollar would not be devalued.

#### INCOME TAX REDUCTION

Mrs. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been working on the bill I am today introducing. I have concluded that it is the proper and most efficacious method of restoring our deteriorating economy to full health.

Unemployment is a persistent sore. The prices of sensitive commodities are at their lowest ebb in 13 years. Industry, with little incentive to reinvest, is apathetic and operating under full potential.

Last week's dip in the stock market may well be a warning signal. A national news magazine this week points out that the stock market crash of 1929 also was punctuated by rebounds such as we are seeing. But thoughtful foresight will prevent a depression of the severity of that which we experienced during the 1930's.

I was impressed with Commerce Secretary Hodges' instant reaction to the

plunge in the stock market. He called for a cut in taxes. The President's Council of Economic Advisers are on record as feeling that tax relief is essential as a spur to increased productivity and its ally, increased employment. Within the last few days Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the Senate Democratic whip, has endorsed a tax cut.

I urge my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, and I urge the House leadership, to act, this session, on the legislation I am introducing.

My bill calls for an immediate reduction of 10 percent in individual income taxes and corporate income taxes. It increases the personal income tax exemption from \$600 to \$700.

I am convinced, and many economic experts on both sides of the political fence support this conviction, that enactment of this type of tax measure would really get our country moving again.

#### WHY A COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS?

Mrs. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 31, I called to the attention of the Members of the House the Rusk letters, which provide additional evidence for a special House Committee on Captive Nations. I now wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this body further evidence of the need to create this special House committee.

I would urge every Member to compare the two Rusk letters with the letter-memorandum submitted by our U.N. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson to the delegations of the U.N. Assembly last November. This Stevenson memo appears in the RECORD of March 7, pages 3567-3568. The concepts, the data, and the interpretations in this memo stand in glaring contradiction to and refutation of the contents of the two Rusk letters. With regard to the many captive nations in the Soviet Union, it is clearly evident that much confusion of thought and a good deal of misinformation exist in our own State Department.

Mr. Speaker, because of its pertinent value to the proposals for a special House Committee on Captive Nations, I will insert in the RECORD at this point an article written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University on the subject "Why a Special Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations?":

#### WHY A SPECIAL CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS?

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In the past year much has been written and said about the necessity of establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the U.S. Congress. House Resolution 211, submitted in March 1961 by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, is the original measure calling for the formation of such a committee. Thirty-nine identical or

similar resolutions have been offered by other Members of Congress. The Republican congressional policy committee is on record for the passage of this important proposal. In addition, thousands of letters from Americans in all sections of the country have been received, favoring and urging the establishment of this committee. A legislative week doesn't go by without many of these letters appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The several hearings conducted by the House Rules Committee on these resolutions have brought out many solid arguments justifying a special committee. At no point has the opposition to this proposal come before the Rules Committee to present in rational outlay any of its counterarguments. The able and distinguished chairman of the committee, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, has afforded those opposing the resolutions every fair opportunity to register their objections and possible refutations in the open. There have been no takers. Instead, all sorts of maneuvers have been resorted to behind the scenes to delay, stall, defeat and even whitewash the proposal for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

One maneuver was to invite the State Department to express its opinion on the resolutions. It is generally known that the Department does not relish a congressional check on its informational defects and limitations as concerns the captive nations. The maneuver was challenged in the form of a request that the Department send a representative in person to testify and also to be available for questions from proponents of the resolutions. The Secretary of State elected to send a 2-page letter, dated August 22, 1961, in which he attempted to explain his opposition to such a committee. Actually, his letter furnished the proponents of the measure additional evidence substantiating the need for a special committee. Recognizing this, the Secretary sent another letter, dated December 27, 1961, to Representative SMITH, hoping to redress his previous mistakes. But again, an almost completely irrelevant letter provides more evidence for the advocates of a special committee.<sup>1</sup>

Still another maneuver has been seized upon to whitewash the proposal in this year of congressional elections. Suddenly the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has decided to hold hearings on the captive nations. Its sporadic and haphazard approach to the subject is at complete variance with that envisioned by the proponents of a special committee. The subject of captive nations in the aggregate is too vital and too sacred to be treated fleetingly by a subcommittee whose jurisdiction doesn't even cover the entire captive world. Without doubt we can look forward to still more evidence supporting the need for a special committee.

Despite these maneuvers, the movement for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations gains strength by the day. Inquiries and expressions of popular support pour into the offices of Congressman FLOOD and others daily. It is extremely important for more and more citizens to know and understand the paramount answers to the question, "Why a Special Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations?"

#### THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION

With reference to imperial Moscow's vast empire it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the basic principle of national self-determination is our most formidable weapon in the cold war. As concerns the issue of a hot global war or no, this moral and political principle is a weapon which we have scarcely begun to use. From many angles it is far

<sup>1</sup> Complete texts of these letters appear in the editorial of this issue.

more potent and determinative than our nuclear armaments and war-equipped space satellites. We have given endless lipservice to this principle, but we have been acutely short on instrumentalizing the principle for victory in the incessant cold war.

The continuing irony of our times is that the negator of this principle—the Russian totalitarians—puts this weapon to far greater instrumental use than we do. Yet it is obvious that this overpowering psychopolitical weapon belongs to us and our traditions and not at all to colonial Moscow. By its methodic and popularized investigations into the captive nations of both Europe and Asia, a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would bring the immensity of this weapon into full and clear relief. It would steadily show the tremendous possibilities and opportunities open to us in a peaceable engagement of ideas and truths with colonial Moscow and Peiping. Its primary impact would be on the consciousness of our own people with regard to the strategic value and importance of all the captive nations to the security interests of the free world.

Needless to say, the facts and data assembled by such a working committee would prove to be of enormous value to our own Department of State. The two Rusk letters give every evidence of faulty conception and understanding of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. The writer offered on a radio network a couple of examples illustrating the factual deficiencies which account for the misconceptions and misunderstandings of the Department.<sup>2</sup>

#### PRESIDENTIAL SUPPORT OF CAPTIVE NATIONS STUDY

Presidential authority constitutes a second good reason why a Special Committee on the Captive Nations should be formed. President Eisenhower issued two Captive Nations Week proclamations during his term of office. In 1959, when the Captive Nations Week resolution was passed by Congress, the President explicitly summoned the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations." This urgent theme was widely repeated in the 1960 Captive Nations Week observances.<sup>3</sup>

Now, there can be no better agency or medium for such popular study of the captive nations than what is provided for in H. Res. 211. A Special Committee on the Captive Nations would quickly become the chief source of information on this subject. Its reports and studies would be made available to every American and foreigner seeking them. The educational value of the committee's operations would be of incalculable worth. President Eisenhower's summons would be more than satisfied.

Even before his election President Kennedy recognized the significance of such studies. During the campaign of 1960 he stated: "I am, of course, in agreement with the Presidential proclamations. The captive nations should be studied intensively. If a Joint Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations is the best way to insure such popular study, I would naturally not be opposed to it." In the 1961 observances of Captive Nations Week this feeling of the President was reflected in his proclamation which was warmly received throughout the country.<sup>4</sup> In it he pointed out that "it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest its interest in

the freedom of other nations" and also urges our people "to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom."

Undoubtedly, a Joint Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations would be a perfectly proportionate response to the nature and value of the subject. However, there are too many vexing problems and hurdles to surmount in attempting to form any type of joint committee. On a more modest but nonetheless adequate level a special committee formed in the House of Representatives would serve the aims and purposes of House Resolution 211. Surely, quoting some of the President's words, it would be the best means for the American people to manifest their indispensable interest in the captive nations and thus recommit themselves through their elected representatives. Such a committee would best reflect the popular will and, what's more, there is an adequate number of legislators in the House with competent knowledge of the subject. The demanding tasks of the committee would be most satisfactorily met through this means.

#### THE AGGREGATIVE STUDY GAP IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Another powerful answer to the question posed here rests on a survey of our requirements in relation to the captive nations. In my reply to some of Secretary Rusk's allegations concerning the adequacy of our studies on the captive nations, I stated: "On this I publicly challenge Secretary Rusk to produce any comprehensive study dealing, for example, with Soviet Russian economic colonialism within the Soviet Union."<sup>5</sup> Many Americans repeated this challenge to him in follow-up letters. To date there has been no reply to this challenge, nor can there be, for no such study exists. It is interesting to note that our Presidents feel the need for more intensive captive nations studies but our present Secretary of State alleges that enough is being done.

The fact is, of course, that no private or public body is engaged in aggregative studies of the captive nations. What we do is largely piecemeal, sporadic, and isolated. Indeed, the fundamental perspective of considering and viewing the captive nations in their aggregate entirety is nowhere present. In short, we are suffering from an intellectual gap in this regard and only our enemy can profit by this. The great and necessary task of studying systematically, objectively and continuously all of the captive nations, particularly those in the U.S.S.R., is nowhere being undertaken.

If we are serious about the captive nations, if we are determined not to ever acquiesce to Moscow's permanent domination over these nations, if we are intent to find all means to win the cold war, then only a special committee can fulfill the tasks of this responsibility for popular study of our allies behind the Iron Curtains of Europe and Asia. Fleeting and basically superficial hearings on some of the captive nations by something less than this make only a political football of the subject.

#### THE FIRST CONCRETE IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC LAW 86-90

Scores of informed Americans are aware of the fact that the Captive Nations Week resolution, now Public Law 86-90, is yet to be implemented by our Government. Much can be done along these lines, and much will be done in time. Of this the writer entertains absolutely no doubt. In fact the establishment of the special committee would represent the first concrete implementation of Public Law 86-90 by our Government. And this is another persuasive reason for such a committee. Congress passed the resolution, and it should be for Congress

to implement it and realize some of its implications.

The actual being of such a committee would in itself certify to the meaning and intent Congress had in mind when it passed the resolution. It would symbolize the determination and resolve of our legislators, the elected representatives of the people, to further the eventual emancipation and freedom of the captive nations. Millions in this country will never forget the fearful reaction of Moscow to the passed resolution. Missiles, satellites, and nuclear bombs seem to be inadequate to curb Moscow's fears of our implementative steps in this direction. Our stress upon captive nations and the basic idea of national self-determination seems to send chills down their spines.

It was no accident that 1 year after the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution, Khrushchev chose to concentrate on the issue of colonialism in the United Nations. He aimed not only at currying the favor of certain Asiatic and African states but also at shifting the spotlight of colonial rule from his own empire. He even permitted his Ukrainian puppets in the U.N. to speak for the first time in the Ukrainian language, and scarcely to our surprise a Mr. Podgorniy, who was supposedly a representative of the "sovereign and free State" of Ukraine, seized the occasion for a heavy attack upon Captive Nations Week.<sup>6</sup>

By no means should we fear to probe this deep fear on the part of the Russian totalitarians. Given this evidence and more, we should be greatly encouraged to pursue the several ramifications of Public Law 86-90. The first step in this is to form a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. It will furnish the answers to the questions raised in the minds of countless Americans who were bewildered by Khrushchev's explosion in July 1959.

#### THE AGGREGATE CONCEPT OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

American thought about the captive world has advanced considerably in the past 3 years. Increasingly the concept of captive nations is not being narrowly synonymized with the few so-called satellites in central Europe. The aggregate concept of captive nations is being progressively accepted. In many quarters it is recognized now that the captive nations in central Europe form only a minority in the large family of captive nations. White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan and others in the Soviet Union itself are being currently mentioned along with North Korea, mainland China, Tibet, and North Vietnam.

This aggregate concept is harmoniously accommodated by House Resolution 211 and 39 other resolutions. With a forward look they are realistically founded on this concept, embracing the captive nations inside the U.S.S.R. as well as outside, in Asia as well as in Europe. Moreover, the resolutions emphasize the primary strategic value of the captive nations in toto from the viewpoint of our security interest. The further development and elaboration of this key concept are additional reasons why a special committee must be formed.

Although nowadays we don't hear much about the new frontiers, a genuine and real frontier continues to exist in connection with our understanding of the U.S.S.R. A special committee would be in the most advantageous position to develop and exploit this new frontier. A full-scale exposure of Moscow's colonial rule in the Soviet Union would unquestionably be in the highest interest of securing peace with justice. Nothing can contribute more to a solid improvement of relations with the U.S.S.R. than a live awareness on our part of Moscow's colonial and imperialist domination over nations within the U.S.S.R. itself. Ambassa-

<sup>2</sup> Dobriansky, L. E., "Captive Nations—Moscow's Achilles' Heel," the Manion Forum, Nov. 12, 1961, pp. 2-3.

<sup>3</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 13, pp. 17675-17694.

<sup>4</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 10, pp. 13168-13197.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit., the Manion Forum, pp. 2-3.

<sup>6</sup> United Nations General Assembly, Oct. 4, 1960, pp. 11-20.

dor Stevenson made a heavy contribution in this regard with his unique memorandum on Russian colonialism last year.<sup>7</sup>

#### THE COLD WAR IN THE RED TOTALITARIAN EMPIRE

The passage of House Resolution 211 is also justified on additional cold war grounds. Invariably when we speak of the cold war, we have only dimension in mind; namely, the so-called Communist world and the free world. But there is another extremely vital dimension, that between the captive peoples and their unrepresentative governments. The cold war, therefore, is not just between Moscow's totalitarian empire and the non-totalitarian free world but also and most fundamentally between the captive peoples and their quisling governments.

It would be myopic, indeed, for us to be misled by Moscow's cold war zigzags. The hot-and-cold treatment is part and parcel of the cold war game. To accede to Moscow's deceitful blandishments in its moments of trouble, whether it is brought on by forces within the U.S.S.R. or by Red China, is tantamount to losing a round to an opponent. This would be rank foolishness. As a matter of fact, this is the time for a peaceable offensive, and a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would provide such an offensive. It would produce a necessary and prudent leverage for the captive peoples in their cold war against colonial Russian domination. Particularly would this be true, as the Honorable Douglas Dillon once intimated, in the prison house of nations, otherwise known as the Soviet Union.<sup>8</sup>

Unthinking utterances about precipitating premature revolutions or igniting a hot global war as a result of such action are only a score for the enemy. For too long the tremendous power of propaganda has been a virtual Russian monopoly. Here, too, it is ironic how easily we become aroused by false notes on Soviet scientific, space or economic growth or supremacy; but Moscow's real superiority in the handling and manipulation of ideas, which are basic to all else, scarcely moves us. Without any exaggeration, the outcome and decision of the cold war hinge on operations in this propaganda area.

A special committee would not be, of course, a propaganda agency. However, its impact in the field would be inevitably great. The truths, facts, perspectives and findings educed by it would strongly counteract and demolish the half-truths and lies disseminated by Moscow and Peiping. It would give the constant lie to the propagandized and overblown Russian image, especially in Asia and Africa. It would, as Ambassador Stevenson called for last year, fix the spotlight of world attention on the colonialism and imperialism rampant throughout the Red totalitarian empire. For example, an overstrain of vision is not required to see the effects of the committee's intensive inquiry into the 30 and more million captive Moslems in the U.S.S.R. These effects could not be but salutary in the entire Moslem world. Moscow's fear of such concentrated, studied concern was amply and surprisingly revealed after Canada's Prime Minister addressed the U.N. in 1960.<sup>9</sup>

#### THE COLD WAR IN THE FREE WORLD

When we turn to the likely effects of the committee's work on the free world and its engagement in the cold war, the probability is high and strong again for a series of salutary results. By concentrating on

<sup>7</sup> Comments by the U.S. delegation to the Soviet memorandum circulated as Document No. A/4889, United Nations General Assembly, Nov. 25, 1961.

<sup>8</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 3, pp. 3527-3529.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., pp. 3529-3532.

the imperio-colonialism of Soviet Russia a special committee would go a long way in enlightening our own people on the space, depth, and significance of the captive nations. The colossal hoax of communism would be clearly shown on the basis of data pertaining to all of these nations.

In his first state of the Union message the President emphasized: "We must never forget our hopes for the ultimate freedom and welfare of the eastern European peoples." Of course, the captive peoples of Asia should have been mentioned, too. But the point here is that an existing and well functioning special committee on the captive nations would give concrete form to the President's admonition and by its works would guarantee that our people would never forget these hopes. As has been said over and over again, the existence of such a committee would also be a permanent reminder to Khrushchev and Mao that we do not now nor shall we ever write off the captive nations. There still are many appeasers in our country who would not like to have such a determination symbolized in this way.

Also, it should be evident from the nature of the Rusk letters and other documents that a special congressional committee would be of invaluable service to our executive organs. Its productive and in many respects pioneering work would also serve our U.N. delegation, our representation in UNESCO, and in many other spheres of our Government. Without question its material would be drawn on by foreign governments and representations. In this connection the interests of our country would be enormously advanced if many other free world representatives were able to speak out with the same scholarly tone and presentation as did Ambassador Tingfu F. Tsiang of China in the 1960 U.N. debate on Russian colonialism.<sup>10</sup>

#### THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND CONGRESS

Congress has a remarkable opportunity to serve the people and our national interest by forming now a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. As mentioned earlier, by such action it would concretely implement the Captive Nations Week resolution which it itself passed in 1959. The special committee would definitely have legislative intent and purpose. Its work, studies, and investigations would lead to many specific findings and conclusions. These would in turn predicate recommendations which would form specific legislative proposals for U.S. conduct in the cold war. The range of the committee's investigations would be largely determined by numerous uncovered and undeveloped aspects of the Red totalitarian empire.

Based on the integralist premise of the new captive nations concept, such a special committee would by nature and function encroach upon no standing committee in the House. With this ruling concept of captive nations in the aggregate, the committee would work along interrelated and more organic lines of inquiry and fact-finding than is possible with any of the standing committees. Its unique orientation, founded on the spirit and essence of the Captive Nations Week resolution itself, would facilitate investigations into phenomena which have been left untapped by existing committees. An excellent case in point is the phenomenon of rampant economic imperialism and colonialism in the U.S.S.R. Another is the Moslem problem in the Soviet Union. Many others related to the so-called satellites and the Asian captive nations can be cited.

Furthermore, objective and far-seeing legislators in Congress recognize that the range and depth of work before such a committee would make unusual demands on its members. A great deal of time, effort, and dedicated application would be necessary.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., pp. 3532-3534.

No standing or some ad hoc committee could possibly assume such burdens. Fortunately, there are many legislators with deep convictions about the captive nations. They would gladly specialize in this field, albeit at cost of time, effort, and much inconvenience. Only a special committee can efficiently enlist and utilize their services.

With Moscow's empire rumbling with troubles, the time for such a committee is now. Time is in our favor now to do what must be done. Nothing else will do.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TRIMBLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. BOGGS.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1347. An act for the relief of Adolf M. Bailer;

H.R. 5652. An act for the relief of Kevork Torolan; and

H.J. Res. 638. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens who are serving in the U.S. Armed Forces.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 1, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Sydney Gruson;

H.R. 1404. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina;

H.R. 1712. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rose DiCarlo;

H.R. 2103. An act for the relief of Antonio C. Ysrael;

H.R. 2672. An act for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith;

H.R. 2839. An act for the relief of Mildred Love Hayley;

H.R. 4783. An act to grant constructive service to members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve for the period from July 25, 1947, to November 1, 1949;

H.R. 8368. An act for the relief of A. Eugene Congress;

H.R. 8570. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit disbursing officers of an armed force to entrust funds to other officers of an armed force;

H.R. 9466. An act for the relief of Sfc. Jesse O. Smith; and

H.R. 11261. An act to authorize an adequate White House Police force, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 5, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2131. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of the activity in the executive branch during fiscal year 1961 to further the Government's user charges policy, pursuant to title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2132. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) relative to the Department of the Air Force requesting approval for the Air National Guard to proceed with certain construction projects at General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2133. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on March 31, 1962; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2134. A letter from the Chairman, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report by the Board of Trustees of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia for the period June 1, 1961, to May 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 86-531, 86th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2135. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on interest charges paid for the construction of a water supply line at Fort Belvoir, Va., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2136. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on fraudulent claims and uneconomical practices in lodging and subsistence allowances paid to members of shore patrols, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2137. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

2138. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend paragraph (2)(G) of subsection 309(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Com-

munications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2139. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of this Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from January 1, 1962, through March 31, 1962, pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2140. A letter from the Administrator National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting copies of a report of contracts negotiated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) (11) and (16), covering the period July 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, pursuant to rule XL of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the provision of 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2141. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 18, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Kentucky River and tributaries, Kentucky, requested by the resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted April 22, 1953, April 21, 1950, and July 29, 1953, respectively (H. Doc. No. 423); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 12 illustrations.

2142. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 31, 1962, the following bill was reported on June 2, 1962:

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 10113. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 11970. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11971. A bill to prohibit indirect financing of primaries and elections out of Federal funds appropriated for highways, to prohibit certain improper and undesirable practices relating to the Federal-aid high-

way program, and for other purposes designed to protect the public interest and investment therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 11972. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 11973. A bill to authorize the appropriation of adequate funds to provide for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 11974. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11975. A bill to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act in 1959 to caretakers and clerks in the employ of the National Guard of a State, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11976. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide automobiles for disabled veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11977. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide special housing and automobiles for certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 11978. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 10 percent reduction in the individual income tax and the corporate income tax, and to increase the personal income tax exemption from \$600 to \$700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 11979. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to make areas lacking public libraries or with inadequate public libraries, public elementary and secondary school libraries, and certain college and university libraries, eligible for benefits under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 11980. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to make areas lacking public libraries or with inadequate public libraries, public elementary and secondary school libraries, and certain college and university libraries, eligible for benefits under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 11981. A bill to provide for an expanded program of rabbit research; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11982. A bill to amend section 215 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the compilation and publication of all regulations of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the is-

suance of a commemorative postage stamp celebrating the 250th anniversary of the founding in 1714 of Natchitoches and there-with the founding of Louisiana, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

**PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11983. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wielkosz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11984. A bill for the relief of Pietro Manicotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11985. A bill for the relief of Odisefs Karanikolas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 11986. A bill for the relief of Julius Nicklas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 11987. A bill for the relief of Thomas E. Speer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 11988. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tsai Shai Goon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 11989. A bill for the relief of Alfred Coleman; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

**PETITIONS, ETC.**

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

363. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Antonio V. Raquiza, Member of the House of Representatives, Republic of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines, relative to calling attention to a bill he introduced "Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in favor of the state visit of President Diosdado Macapagal to the United States", which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

**Income Distribution of the Tax Provisions of the King-Anderson Bill**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF**

**HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1962

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, being under the general impression that the workingman would be contributing more percentagewise for medical expense aid available under the King-Anderson bill than he would contribute to funds available through the present Kerr-Mills legislation, I asked the Ways and Means Committee counsel to prepare for me a memorandum indicating how various income groups contributed to the general tax fund as well as specifically to the social security funds. My initial opinions were substantiated, since the workingman is contributing at least twice as much to the social security fund percentagewise than to the General Treasury.

Figures submitted with the quoted memorandum indicate that on the revenue table, 53.5 percent of all social security income is secured from persons with incomes of \$5,000 per year and less. This same income group on the other hand contributes only 26.4 percent of the general tax fund from which Kerr-Mills legislation secures its funds. Accordingly, the workingman then contributes more than twice as much for the same dollar's worth of medical assistance under the King-Anderson bill as he would through the present Kerr-Mills legislation. It appears that this argument has not been emphasized enough in our discussion of this controversial legislation.

The memorandum referred to follows:

This memorandum is in response to your request to Leo Irwin for some statistics relating to the income distribution of the tax provisions of the King-Anderson bill.

The following table on percentage share is based on the paper on the "Income Distribution of the Tax Burden" by Prof. Richard Musgrave submitted to the Fiscal Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee during their 1955 panel on Federal tax policy for economic growth and statistics. These are based on data reflect-

ing 1954 income distributions. If you wanted to visualize these at current income levels, it would be reasonably accurate to use the same percentage figures and raise each of the income class items by 25 percent, that is, the figures in the top row would generally apply to the income class in 1962 of zero to \$2,500.

*Percentage share of tax burden by income classes, social-insurance contributions, personal income taxes, and all other Federal taxes, 1954*

Income class	Social-insurance contribution	Federal individual income tax	All Federal taxes excluding social insurance contribution
0 to \$2,000.....	6.8	1.6	3.2
\$2,000 to \$3,000.....	10.3	3.7	4.9
\$3,000 to \$4,000.....	17.9	8.0	8.5
\$4,000 to \$5,000.....	18.5	10.2	9.8
\$5,000 to \$7,500.....	28.6	28.3	23.9
\$7,500 to \$10,000.....	8.6	13.9	11.0
Over \$10,000.....	9.1	34.3	38.7
Total.....	100	100	100

The table indicates that the burden of financing social insurance legislation is concentrated far more heavily in the lower brackets than in the rest of the Federal tax structure. At 1962 levels, one could say that individuals above \$12,500 of income pay only about 9 percent of the cost of social security but they pay about one-third of the Federal individual income taxes and almost 40 percent of the total burden of Federal taxes excluding social insurance contributions.

This table is based upon the assumption that the employer part of the social security taxes is reflected in the price of the products that they sell and consequently the burden of the employer tax is distributed generally in the manner of a general sales tax.

**The Uruguay National Lottery**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF**

**HON. PAUL A. FINO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to apprise the Members of this House with the Uruguay national lottery.

In this small country of some 3 million people, the national lottery brought

in gross receipts of almost \$15 million in 1961. The profit accruing to the Uruguay treasury was close to \$5 million. These funds were earmarked for unemployment benefits, physical education, and for that nation's fight against TB.

Mr. Speaker, this South American country has the sense to realize that great benefits may be derived from a national lottery. We, too, can realize a tremendous benefit here in the United States with our own Government-run lottery.

A national lottery in the United States can produce over \$10 billion a year in additional income which can be used to cut taxes and reduce our national debt. What a lift this would be to Mr. and Mrs. American Taxpayer.

**Washington Report**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF**

**HON. BRUCE ALGER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of June 2, 1962:

**WASHINGTON REPORT**

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

Is consistency a virtue? Is it important that a man stand for something? Should a Member of Congress vote his convictions or not? Should men in public office be truthful with constituents or should men be political, defined (by some) as taking both sides of an issue or dodge the issue entirely? In elections, should people support one candidate or both opposing candidates so as to be a supporter of whomever wins? Does intellectual honesty make any difference today. One may well ponder these questions and their answers. There is even danger of being branded prudish or "holier than thou" if a strict standard of public service is followed.

To continue the worksheet of a conservative theme (newsletter, May 19). To document the statement "A conservative does not believe our Federal Government is designed to nor can successfully feed, clothe, house, provide jobs and basic necessities," let's recall today's legislation and the direction of

this administration. Food—farm program, Public Law 480, food distribution both at home and worldwide, school lunch and milk programs, surplus foods combined with welfare programs. Housing—public housing by the millions, urban renewal, area redevelopment. Jobs—public works, area redevelopment, wage setting (Davis Bacon-Walsh Healey). Clothing—public assistance. Basic necessities—public power, peacetime GI insurance, small business loans, medical care, etc. These are but a few examples. Under foreign aid, of course, we are engaged in all areas overseas. For my part, I shall continue consistently to interpret the Constitution as limited government of checks and balances between Federal-State with residual power in the people and between executive, legislative, and judicial.

The effect of the President's dictatorial suppression of the steel industry has spread throughout the entire Nation's business, evidenced by the stock market plunge. It is interesting to observe the President's economic adviser, Mr. Heller, as he flounders around trying to explain the market without crediting the President's action as the cause. (Subject: "Now they're lying about economics": "Walter Heller, President Kennedy's top economic adviser, tried to explain away the crash in the stock market by claiming that the American people have so much confidence in the administration's ability to hold the economy in line that they are selling stocks in the knowledge that inflation is a thing of the past. This woolly headed thinking illustrates the confusion at the White House. Heller, in a speech Monday, said consumer prices have held steady since the administration came into office. This is a lie. The fact is that consumers prices rose again in April to an alltime high of 105.2. They have jumped 0.7 percent this year, already as much as they rose last year—a total of 1.4 percent since Kennedy came into office. \* \* \* Heller said the stock market is no indicator of business conditions, that conditions are just fine, and that the 'recovery' will extend well into 1963." Issue of the day, National Republican Congressional Committee). This is the adviser whose advice West Germany categorically turned down as it went instead to private enterprise as the answer and soared to new heights. Perhaps the President's strange outlook on the role of government in our lives was best stated by him in his New York medicare speech. "The fact of the matter is that what we are now talking about doing, most of the countries of Europe did years ago. The British did it 30 years ago. We are behind every country, pretty nearly, in Europe, in this matter of medical care for our citizens." Imagine such a statement from the man heading the Government of the Nation that has the finest medical care in the world, where no one is denied medical care for lack of money, a country whose health and freedom has resulted in pouring our wealth into these countries the President would emulate. Well, Hitler, Mussolini, Fascists, Communists, and Socialists have abounded in these countries and they haven't given up trying to make us over. They've been trying since before 1776, but we've been helping them only the last 30 years—since the beginning of the New Deal. President Kennedy is accelerating this change. Ironically, it is true that we cannot be made over from without, but only from within. The changes are going on before our eyes. The question is will people see it in time to stop it. Here's another account of what's happening to us. (Subject: The big lie—Kennedy's technique: "Even though he got caught in a medical care lie during the 1960 campaign, President John F. Kennedy apparently didn't learn anything, or is too indifferent toward the truth to care. On Sunday he spun another fabrication in his rally plea for medical care under social security. Again he trampled

facts to create fiction. In 1960, Kennedy made a television film with an elderly man in Kentucky. The man claimed he had used up his life savings of around \$900 to pay for treatment of a hip injury. He ended the program with a plea for social security medical care. Investigation revealed: (1) The man had a private health insurance plan. (2) He spent only \$80 (would have spent only \$50 except he wanted a semi-private room). (3) He had told Kennedy about the private health care plan, but was warned not to mention it on the program. The money-laden Kennedy distributed this film copiously through TV stations all over the country. The big lie was brazen, calculated and deliberate." Issue of the day, National Republican Congressional Committee). Many people say that people get the kind of government they deserve. Do the people of the United States deserve the kind of government they're getting today? What do you think?

### Breakthrough for U.S. Air Capability

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, we recently had a striking example of the way in which our Nation's military capability will be aided by bold leadership on the part of private American enterprise.

I am referring to the fact that Pan American World Airways has announced the purchase of two American-built, all-cargo jet aircraft. Designated the 707-321C and manufactured by the Boeing Aircraft Co. of Seattle, they are the latest products of which America's vital aircraft industry can be proud.

When the potentialities of this aircraft purchase are realized, we will find that it represents an advance in both military and commercial cargo transportation comparable to the transition from propeller to jet aircraft in the field of passenger transportation.

Let us consider what this purchase means to the national defense. Since these new cargo jets will be enrolled in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, the Armed Forces, for the first time, will have on call truly modern all-cargo jet aircraft, which are financed, operated, and maintained by a commercial air carrier at no expense to the Government.

With the speed, range, and carrying capacity of these jets, a major contribution will be made to our military Reserve in times of emergencies. These Boeing cargo jets will be able to fly nonstop to almost any of the world's trouble spots, carrying troops or material, or a combination of both. They will be capable of carrying missiles, trucks, ambulances, and other mobile equipment used by an airborne battle group.

One of these planes alone can transport 82 percent of the daily rations of an airborne division. On a flight between Travis Air Force Base and Hickham Field, Hawaii, for example, this would mean the delivery of almost 600,000 pounds of cargo per week. As an illustration of the planes' flexibility, each

could move 84 troops with 40,000 pounds of cargo, or 108 troops with 24,000 pounds of cargo.

As to the long-range value of this aircraft, consider a flight from McChord Air Force Base in my State of Washington to Tokyo, Japan. That represents a distance of 4,860 miles. On a nonstop flight, one of these planes could carry 43,000 pounds of cargo from McChord to Tokyo, or 160 battle-equipped troops. This aircraft, in other words, is unique in this capacity, as no other aircraft could fulfill such a mission.

The new Boeing all-cargo jets, whose construction is giving further impetus to the economy of the Northwest, will symbolize the introduction of truly mass transport of cargo by air. An ultimate result could be a reduction in cargo rates and, by making possible a reduction of inventories and the elimination of warehousing, a new concept of distribution.

It is gratifying also to learn that Pan American continues in its diligent support of our military services and again is pioneering in the development of commercial air cargo. The company is to be congratulated on this farsighted move and for being the first to take delivery on this splendid airplane. The acquisition of the Boeing 707-321C's by our commercial air carriers will indisputably result in further aid to our defense posture and, by increasing international trade, mean an improvement in the Nation's balance of payments.

### Reduction of the National Debt

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is currently considering the question of temporarily increasing the national debt ceiling. I have submitted testimony in opposition to this increase, and in my testimony also called for adoption of a plan to provide for systematic reduction of the debt itself. Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include my statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE PAUL G. ROGERS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM FLORIDA, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, JUNE 1, 1962, ON THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished committee, thank you very much for the opportunity to present my views on the proposal to provide a temporary increase in the national debt. Let me say, with all due respect to this great committee, that I am opposed to an increase in the national debt, and that I urge the committee to disapprove any such increase. Further, I respectfully request that the committee give its most serious consideration to reduction of the debt. This purpose could be accomplished by H.R. 1080, a bill which I introduced to provide for systematic repayment of the national debt.

H.R. 1080, if enacted, would require the Secretary of the Treasury to apply a sum

equal to 1 percent of the national debt annually in payment on the debt principal. A system such as this one would guarantee payment on the debt, and there is no such statutory provision for planned payment of the debt at this time.

The national debt now stands at approximately \$298 billion as a result of the temporary increase enacted last year. When this increase expires July 1, 1962, the debt ceiling will return to \$285 billion, unless otherwise altered by legislation. As this committee knows, a debt ceiling is a brake on Government spending, and we are spending too much.

Any proposal to increase the national debt must also involve the reduction of the debt. There is a correlation between the size of the national debt and the interest burden it carries. As the debt grows larger, the public is saddled with higher taxes to support its obligations.

As you can see, there must be repayment on the debt itself. Morally, each American has been taught that he must meet his financial obligations. When we borrow money, we do so in good faith, and it is only fitting that we pay it back. The economic realities of life demand that we repay our debts if we are to maintain good credit. In the business world, debt repayment is essential to our national economy. Yet in the biggest business this Nation has—the business of Government—there is no specific provision for planned repayment of our debts.

The Federal budget for fiscal year 1963 contains an item in the amount of some \$9.4 billion for interest on the national debt. This amount represents an interest rate of 3.2 percent as of April 30, 1962. Yet nowhere in the Federal budget is there an item marked for payment on the debt itself.

In 1790, the national debt could have been completely satisfied had each American paid \$19 into the U.S. Treasury. At the end of the War of 1812, that figure would have been \$15. Just after the Civil War, a payment of \$78 from every American would have satisfied the debt. After World War I, \$240 was needed. Today, with the public debt totaling some \$298 billion, a payment of \$1,604 would be needed from every living American to satisfy it. This would be a payment over and above the taxes collected each year to keep the Government running.

This Nation is engaged in a great struggle for the survival of its freedoms. The great global conflicts which the United States has experienced in recent years are certainly major factors in our increasing indebtedness. Today our resources are tapped with needs for huge armies and explorations into outer space. Our national economy is fortunately able to accommodate most of these essential expenditures.

However, there are many programs which are not essential to the survival of democracy. It is this sort of nonessential spending which I believe to be against the best interests of our Nation's welfare. Foreign aid is a prime example of the kind of program which could be reduced immediately. Last year, the foreign aid program came to nearly half of the interest on the national debt itself. The American taxpayer would be greatly relieved, I am sure, if we were to substitute an item in the Federal budget to apply as payment on the national debt in place of the excessive billions spent on foreign aid. What priority does debt reduction have in our Government when every conceivable program comes first?

Mr. Chairman, the reduction of the national debt must be done on an orderly, programmed basis. Should this committee approve legislation to apply 1 percent of the debt as payment on the national debt itself, with no change in the current permanent debt ceiling of \$285 billion, the debt could

be reduced to \$232 billion in 20 years, and \$172 billion in 50 years. This reduction in the principal would result in a saving of nearly \$19 billion in interest alone for the first 20 years, and a saving of nearly \$100 billion in interest over 50 years.

I urge this distinguished committee to approve this plan for systematic reduction of the national debt as soon as possible. We must face up to fiscal responsibility sometime. We ought to start now.

### Refugees in Europe and Refugees in Dade County, Fla.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD the text of a citation awarded the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANCIS E. WALTER, by the U.S. Committee on Refugees and the text of an address made by Mr. WALTER on that occasion:

WALTER AWARDED CITATION FOR MERITORIOUS SERVICE BY U.S. COMMITTEE FOR REFUGEES—APPEALS FOR EFFORT TO RESETTLE CUBAN REFUGEES OUTSIDE OF FLORIDA

The U.S. Committee for Refugees at its annual meeting held in Washington, D.C., on May 22, 1962, awarded Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, the following citation for meritorious service:

"Citation for outstanding work on behalf of the world's homeless is awarded to the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, Member of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, in which his long service has been marked by deep concerns for the problems of migrants and refugees—as a Member of the House Judiciary Committee, the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, Delegate to the Council of Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and the author of basic refugee legislation, whose most recent bill providing for continued support of international refugee and migration programs reflects the broad humanitarian approach to which his countrymen are by tradition committed. In grateful appreciation,

"MAXWELL M. RABB,  
"President.

"WILLIAM L. BREESE,  
"Secretary."

In accepting the citation, Representative WALTER made the following address:

"Mr. Chairman, I accept this splendid citation with gratitude and humility. I accept it not as honoring myself only but addressed to all my colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary, and in the House of Representatives itself, who made it possible for the humanitarian legislation you refer to, to be placed on the statute books of the United States.

"The sentiments expressed in the citation are obviously directed to all of those in the Congress of the United States who since the end of World War II have seen to it that their country is at all times equipped with legal instrumentality permitting to extend a helping hand to victims of totalitarian persecution who had to flee their lands. It is in that context that I am proud to receive

the citation in behalf of my colleagues in the Congress.

"The principal merit of our refugee legislation—in my opinion—lies in the fact that it realistically addressed itself to an existing problem. Assistance and resettlement opportunities were extended to specified people and available in the area where assistance was needed.

"Looking at the situation facing all of us—the Government of the United States and the American voluntary agencies—at the present time—I wonder whether we have not somewhat deviated from this principal feature of our joint activities.

"Let me convey to you, in the spirit of true friendship and frankness, a few thoughts and a few figures.

"It appears to me that there exists at this time a striking difference between the refugee problem in Europe and the problem of refugees in the United States. What I have in mind is the difference between the situation existing today in the traditional area of our efforts and expenditures—countries like Western Germany, Italy, Austria, on the one hand, and just one area of the United States—Dade County, Fla., on the other.

"I have done some homework lately—here and abroad—and I am startled with the results.

"In the course of last year, approximately 100 escapees from behind the Iron Curtain appeared in the free countries of Western Europe per month. Twice that number of Cuban refugees enter Florida per day.

"The entire caseload of the U.S. escape program (USEP) in Europe and the Near East, as of last month, was less than 6,000 persons. This is the equivalent of 1 month's influx of Cuban refugees into Florida.

"However, this small USEP caseload is inflated by over 2,200 Yugoslavs with more than questionable claims to political refugee status. Further, USEP caseload appears to suffer from a little temporary swelling by the inclusion of emigrants in transit from one or two countries behind the Iron Curtain to the hospitable Republic of Israel.

"I hope that steps undertaken under consistent congressional prodding will soon lead to the much-needed pruning of USEP's caseload. If this is done, the number of those who may, at least with some degree of justification, claim political refugee status, would certainly drop to 1,500 or 2,000 persons in the entire area of USEP's operations. This is precisely the number of Cuban refugees entering Florida each week.

"In the course of almost 2 years' operation conducted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service pursuant to the 1960 Fair Share Act, only 11,246 refugees were found in Europe and the Near East to be qualified for entry into the United States. As you know, no effort was spared by the administrators of the law and by the voluntary agencies to find more refugees qualifying for entry. Those efforts notwithstanding, it is impossible to reach the statutorily authorized fair share which is 16,490. One of the most characteristic figures which I obtained is the figure of some 2,000 refugees in Europe who, after having registered for entry into the United States, have changed their minds, withdrawn their petitions when invited for interviews by our immigration officers, and informed them that they preferred to remain in economically prosperous Europe.

"The contrast between this picture and the refugee situation in this country is striking, indeed. Official figures submitted to me just 3 days ago indicate that while we were beating the bushes to find, in Europe, refugees desirous of coming to the United States, the number of Cuban refugees already in this country had reached 114,000. The Department of State is issuing entry permits for Cuban refugees at the rate of 700 per day,

or 3,500 per week. The current rate of new applications for entry is 20,000 each month. There are, at the present time, 160,000 entry permits stacked up in the immigration office at Miami International Airport awaiting the arrival of more Cuban refugees.

"At this rate—and nothing indicates that the influx will abate—we will have by the end of this year 160,000 Cuban refugees in this country and we will double this figure, or at least bring it to 300,000 in 1963.

"Why did I seize upon this festive occasion to swamp you with these facts and figures? The answer is simple: I wish to appeal to you for help.

"I wish to join my friend, Secretary Ribicoff, who appeared last week with a similar appeal before the conference of mayors requesting their help in providing for resettlement of Cuban refugees, the many thousands who are already in Florida, and those who will soon arrive there, so that the burden might be shared rather than kept on the shoulders of one community or one county.

"I simply wish to appeal to you to concentrate your efforts on the area where there is a most difficult problem, a problem steadily increasing in scope and fraught with economic and social complications and dangers.

"The U.S. escapee program in Europe and in the Near East, is spending considerable sums of money, taxpayers' money, not money coming from voluntary contributions, for maintaining offices and staffs counseling—under contracts—the steadily dwindling number of refugees on a variety of subjects, including the problem of where to obtain an immigrant visa which the refugee is reluctant to apply for anyway, because he found employment and housing in the country which gave him asylum.

"The situation in Florida is just the reverse. The number of Cuban refugees who—as time progresses—desire more and more to be removed from the shores of Florida into communities where they may not have to rely on welfare assistance provided by Secretary Ribicoff's agency, is steadily increasing. They are the ones who need counseling, the communities that might accept them need counseling, and potential American employers need counseling.

"I am convinced that if the American voluntary agencies would expend in Florida just a fraction of the funds and efforts spent in Western Europe, Secretary Ribicoff's appeal would begin to bear fruit very soon.

"Your committee, I am sure, will not deny us its support and join the efforts designed to have the American voluntary agencies and civic groups concentrate on the most pressing refugee problem—the problem of refugees in the United States."

**Results of 1962 Public Opinion Poll**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1962

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 months, I have been conducting a public opinion poll in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent here. It has been my purpose to solicit the opinions of a large segment of the people of southeastern Ohio to determine their feelings about important issues that are awaiting action by the House of Repre-

sentatives. Participation in the poll was not limited to any special group. Through the mailing of a questionnaire and the cooperation of district newspapers, which kindly reprinted the questionnaire as a public service, the opportunity to participate was made available to all of those interested in expressing their views.

The poll contained 18 questions relating to matters of domestic and foreign policy. The results of this opinion survey are now available. It is surprising that the tabulation indicates such definite trends in the thinking of the people of the district. The results show that opinions on half of the questions registered more than 75 percent support or opposition.

The poll expressed great concern over the national debt, approving by 89.4 percent the proposal that the annual Federal budget should include funds for a systematic reduction of the national debt. Other issues included approval of stronger laws to assure safety of drugs and cosmetics, 83.6 percent; opposition to the President's request for tariff-cutting authority, 76.8 percent; opposition to foreign aid or food for Poland and Yugoslavia, 82.2 percent; opposition to high price supports and more stringent Federal controls over farm production, 81.8 percent; approval of the proposal to require, by law, disclosure of interest rates at the time loans are made or installment credit is granted, 84.9 percent; opposition to granting power to the President to adjust income taxes, 88 percent; and approval of the use of wiretap evidence by the Federal Government for certain serious offenses, 85.1 percent.

The question of sending U.S. troops to Vietnam and other countries of southeast Asia to defend this area from Communist penetration showed the narrowest division of opinion—40.1 percent in favor and 44.9 percent opposing. It also reflected the greatest indecision with 15 percent registering no opinion. The second closest division related to whether stronger civil rights laws are needed. On this issue 48.5 percent favored stronger laws, 37 percent opposed and 14.5 percent expressed no opinion.

In the debate over medical care for the aged, the poll indicated widespread popular concern about both the issue and the problem underlying it. A total of 22.2 percent favored the social security approach taken in the King-Anderson bill. The philosophy of the Kerr-Mills Act, embodying Federal-State assistance based on need, was favored by 19.2 percent. A voluntary program of medical insurance, with costs shared by private individuals and the Federal Government, received the support of 17.2 percent. Private hospitalization insurance and no Federal participation was favored by 33.2 percent.

Many hundreds of persons returning the questionnaire added comments discussing the issues. Although these comments are extremely helpful to me in assessing the feelings of the people of the district, it is not possible, unfortunately, to reflect them in statistical form. However, I wish to point out that a very large

proportion of those making comments expressed serious concern and outspoken opposition to increasing the powers of the President and greater Federal expenditures that are producing mounting deficits and adding to the burden of the national debt.

Following are the detailed results of the poll:

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve the President's request for authority to buy \$100,000,000 in United Nations bonds?.....	27.5	66.3	6.2
2. Are stronger laws needed to assure safety and effectiveness of drugs and cosmetics offered for sale?.....	83.6	11.2	5.2
3. Should the United States resume atomic testing in the atmosphere?.....	63.7	25.3	11.0
4. Do you favor the President's request for greater authority to lower or abolish tariffs?.....	19.7	76.8	3.5
5. Should U.S. foreign aid funds and surplus food be made available to the Communist governments of Poland and Yugoslavia?.....	11.5	82.2	6.3
6. Do you agree with the President's plan for higher price supports for farm commodities and more stringent Federal controls on farm production?.....	13.3	81.8	4.9
7. Should the Federal budget each year include funds for a systematic reduction of the national debt?.....	89.4	6.1	4.5
8. Should servicemen be granted educational and home loan benefits similar to those provided for World War II and Korean veterans?.....	55.8	37.8	6.4
9. Should it be required by law that lenders and vendors disclose in advance actual interest rates on loans and installment credit?.....	84.9	10.3	4.8
10. Should Congress approve the President's request for \$2,000,000,000 for standby public works programs in case of a recession?.....	38.9	56.1	5.0
11. Should Congress give the President power to raise and lower income taxes?.....	8.0	88.0	4.0
12. Should the Federal Government be empowered to use wiretap evidence in cases involving security, organized crime, and other serious offenses?.....	85.1	10.2	4.7
13. Do you support the President's proposal for \$747,800,000 in Federal aid to improve the quality of grade and high school education?.....	36.5	57.7	5.8
14. Are you in favor of tax deductions for parents to assist them in paying college tuition costs for their children?.....	60.9	35.3	3.8
15. Do you approve the President's request for \$4,870,000,000 for the foreign aid program during the next 12 months?.....	16.1	75.1	8.8
16. Do you believe the United States should send troops to defend Vietnam or other countries in southeast Asia from Communist penetration?.....	40.1	44.9	15.0
17. Are stronger civil rights laws needed?.....	48.5	37.0	14.5
18. Which one of the following plans for medical care for the aged do you approve:			
A. A compulsory Federal program of hospitalization and nursing home care to persons over 65 eligible for social security, paid for by increased social security taxes?.....	22.2		
B. A Federal-State program of assistance based on need, financed from general revenues?.....	19.2		
C. A voluntary program of medical insurance, with costs shared by the Federal Government and individual beneficiaries?.....	17.2		8.2
D. Private hospitalization insurance and no Federal participation?.....	33.2		

## Smoking and Health

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1962

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, in recent days there has been considerable discussion of the question of the causes of lung cancer. Certain statements have been made that reflect adversely upon the tobacco industry in a most unfair manner.

In an effort to clarify some of the points raised, I have communicated with Dr. Clarence Cook Little, scientific director of the tobacco industry research committee, asking his informed views on the subject. Dr. Little, a cancer scientist for 53 years, is former president of the Universities of Michigan and Maine, and founder of the Jackson Memorial Laboratory in Maine. He is an eminent scientist who is widely respected both in this country and around the world.

I include herewith my letter to Dr. Little and his reply and commend this to the reading of the Members of the House:

MAY 28, 1962.

DR. CLARENCE COOK LITTLE,  
Scientific Director, Tobacco Industry Research Committee, New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. LITTLE: I have noticed much discussion on the recent report on "Smoking and Health" by the Royal College of Physicians in England. The impression has been given that there has been a major change in the situation involving smoking and health.

Because of your long experience as a cancer scientist and your position as scientific director of the tobacco industry research committee, I would like your views about some questions that are being raised.

Does this English report contain new findings that affect the situation regarding smoking? Should there be a reexamination or changes in the research programs being conducted into smoking and health questions?

Your comments on this matter will be received with interest.

With kindest regards, I am

W. M. ABBITT.

TOBACCO INDUSTRY RESEARCH COMMITTEE,  
New York, N.Y., May 31, 1962.

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT,  
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ABBITT: This is in response to your inquiry whether the scientific situation regarding questions of tobacco use and health is changed as the result of the report by the Royal College of Physicians and of the subsequent publicity given the report in England and in this country.

Also, you ask whether the report contains any new facts that should bring about a reexamination of the research on this problem being supported by the tobacco industry research committee as well as other organizations.

The briefest answer to your questions is "no."

The British Medical Journal, impressed by the report, nonetheless says, "The report does not present any new unpublished facts."

The report does not include any original findings of investigations carried out by the Royal College or under its auspices. It represents

merely a review and evaluation of certain preexisting data already published and considered. That the report is no more than a summary and critique of previously available evidence is admitted by its authors.

The scientific situation regarding what is known and what is not known about lung cancer and other diseases under consideration remains as it was before the Royal College report. These diseases are exceedingly complex problems.

In dealing with biological problems, especially those involving basic life processes, it is difficult but essential to distinguish between what is actually known, what is advanced as theory or deduction, what is opinion, and what is actually not known. This applies directly and importantly to cancer.

When emotional attitudes become involved, as they most certainly do in the tobacco and health situation, these essential differences become even more difficult to distinguish.

The Royal College of Physicians report is a serious document that selects and presents some known facts, considerable theory and deduction, much opinion, and even a little of what is not known. It does this in such a manner as to advance the hypothesis that cigarette smoking is a major cause of lung cancer, and may be involved in other diseases. The authors thereupon urge restrictive measures against cigarettes.

For the research scientist, this approach leaves too many questions unanswered. The purpose of research is to find out what is not known. What are some of the questions and basic information which the Royal College of Physicians report either does not answer or neglects? It may be well to remind ourselves of what is and is not known.

Statistical data, upon which the Royal College of Physicians report and earlier similar reviews chiefly rely, may help point out a problem; they do not provide the solution. This is clearly brought out by a comment on statistical and epidemiological data in a U.S. Public Health Service monograph on cancer morbidity published in 1959:

"In the study of cancer, a disease that apparently can be induced by a multiplicity of etiological agents, one cannot realistically expect to do more than identify factors that appear to be frequently associated with cancer. The proof of an etiological relationship must then be sought through more intensive clinical or experimental studies."

The answer to the question, "What are the basic causes of lung cancer?" must be sought by methods other than statistical studies. What are some of the more specific questions that are in need of research attention?

Why has there been consistent and universal failure in every effort to induce lung cancer in animals by having them inhale tobacco smoke during their entire lifetimes? Experimental animals can develop lung cancer under certain experimental challenges. This has been done with certain viruses and with viruses in combination with such aerosols as synthetic smog.

What, if any, is the role of viruses in lung cancer? An increasing amount of scientific research suggests the possibility that viruses may be involved in the causation of some types of cancer. They are known to be so involved in some cancer in animals. Many studies have shown that lung damage resulting from virus infections may possibly predispose to lung cancer. Experimental work in this field is now rapidly opening up new leads and methods of investigation.

How much lung cancer arises as a result, or in areas, of previous lung damage from such bacterial diseases as tuberculosis and pneumonia? Within a generation we have seen the death rates from such infectious lung diseases decrease sharply. This means the survivors of such illnesses are now living into the older age brackets when they are

apparently more susceptible to lung cancer, or to many other types of cancer. Evidence continues to accumulate to show that lung cancers often arise around old lung damage scars. These leads need further research attention to learn if previous lung ailments may provide a clue to susceptibility in lung cancer.

If smoking does have a role in the development of lung cancer, by what mechanism does this occur? Most theories originally advanced on this question have been either abandoned or extremely modified. In discussing this question in January 1962, the British publication the *Lancet* observed: "No classical carcinogen (cancer-producing agent) has been found in adequate concentration in tobacco smoke; no genuine lung cancers have been produced experimentally; and, though tobacco tar produces cancer when painted in mouse skin, it is a slow and ineffective agent by all ordinary standards." In discussing this fact, the *Lancet*, which accepts the cigarette theory of lung cancer causation, can only speculate as to a possible role for smoke as a promoting agent or cocarcinogen. But this leaves the realm of the known fact and ventures into the area of the uncertain opinion.

Why do pathologists, in their studies of lung tissues and lung cancer sections, disagree on such basic questions as how much increase there has been in lung cancer? What kinds of lung cancer are the predominant problem? Where do lung cancers originate in the main passages (bronchi) where all inhalation hits or in the more remote parts (peripheries) of the lung? Firm knowledge on questions such as these could affect the scientific world's whole attitude toward the problem of lung cancer. A number of recent studies, either omitted from or given scant attention in the Royal College of Physicians' report, have demonstrated that the answers even to such fundamental questions as these are not known, and may well not be as previously supposed.

If even the nature and the origin of the problem are not known, how is it possible to define, much less be precise, about a role of any single factor or combination of factors?

Why is it, as the Royal College of Physicians' report states, that tobacco is something "most smokers enjoy without injury to their health?" We need to learn more about the differences between those people, including the majority of smokers, who do not appear to incur a risk of certain diseases and those who, according to statistical studies, apparently incur a greater health risk for those diseases.

We should seek to learn more about the differences between the person who becomes a heavy smoker and one who does not smoke. Several studies already made in this area strongly suggest that important personality and constitutional traits are distributed differently in smoking populations than in non-smoking groups. Is it not worth further investigation to determine whether the smoking pattern is a reflection of these differences? Might it be that the genetic, hormonal, emotional and other internal influences are the clues to differences in health risks?

These are just some of the important questions to which the research scientist does not know the answers. There are many others. That some may be difficult questions to deal with is recognized, but it is nonetheless important that research attention be directed to them.

In developing the research program for the tobacco industry research committee during the past 8 years, my colleagues on the scientific advisory board have always been guided by a major policy point: We do not take any position that we are attempting to prove or disprove; rather we seek to find the answers

to the health problems that are being studied. The research grants made by the board now total over \$5 million and have been made to independent scientists in the search for facts. We have not been restricted in any way, either by industry request or lack of funds, in being able to support research work that we believe necessary to help acquire the knowledge needed.

In 1960, the entire scientific advisory board agreed in a statement that the "most significant development has been the general recognition that we do not yet have the answers, that an association between the extent of tobacco use and the incidence of lung cancer does not prove a causal relationship, that experimental verification is essential, and that there are a number of other factors which need to be considered." This position has not been changed.

New significant research findings are eagerly examined to see how they add to our knowledge or may open up new avenues of investigations. Reviews such as that issued by the Royal College of Physicians may help to bolster opinion, but they do not add scientific facts.

Much research reported in the past few years has tended to weaken, rather than to support, the hypothesis that cigarette smoking is a causative factor in lung cancer.

Further research may bring about other changes in knowledge about lung cancer and in the approaches to research on this and other forms of cancer. For cancer is not just a single disease, but one of many shapes and faces, of delicate complexity, and involves many mechanisms that are a part of our body and our growth processes.

If science is to have the opportunity to solve the problem of cancer, or similar diseases, we must be skeptical of claims for simple solutions. Continued research is the only route to scientific truth.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE C. LITTLE, Sc.D.,  
Scientific Director.

Hon. Carl Albert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1962

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 26, it was my good fortune and great honor to be present at the graduating exercises of the John Brown University of Siloam Springs, Ark., in the district which I am honored to represent. This is a great institution, and its imprint will last through the ages.

One of the highlights of the graduating exercise was the commencement address delivered by our colleague and friend, the majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma. He was given an honorary degree of doctor of laws at the graduation ceremonies. His inspiring address to the graduates is included as a part of my remarks:

POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THE NEW AGE IN SCIENCE  
(By Hon. CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma.)

Dr. Brown, faculty members, graduates, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor to be the speaker chosen to make your first commencement address since the accreditation of John Brown University by the North Central Association. I congratulate you upon having won this important recognition. I know that the high standards it required

are maintained and implemented at this school.

The members of the graduating class have devoted 4 years of hard effort to the development of mental, spiritual, and physical excellence as prescribed in John Brown's famous axiom—Head-Heart-Hand. Never in his history has man been so urgently pressed to bring every faculty into play and to develop every human resource. The philosophy of your school is designed to prepare its graduates to enter a world filled with challenges—many of them unknown and undefined.

A few days ago in the Speaker's office in the Capitol in Washington, D.C., I had the privilege of having a brief conversation with Titov and John Glenn, both of whom within the year had the experience of circumnavigating the globe at a speed many times as fast as the sun and at altitudes never reached by man before. Reduced to human terms, these flights symbolize the contest for military and scientific superiority between two great powers. These two young men represent a struggle between conflicting ways of life: the one was reported to have said he trusted God in his flight; the other that he never did think about God. The outcome of this struggle will influence the ultimate destiny of mankind more than any event since the Resurrection.

The school years of this graduating class span an era of spectacular scientific achievement which has brought new dimensions to power and space. In 1942 when the members of this class were scarcely more than infants, Enrico Fermi, an Italian immigrant, working in a squash court at the University of Chicago, produced the first nuclear chain reaction. In a coded message sent to Dr. James B. Conant in Washington, D.C., Dr. Arthur Compton heralded the atomic age by saying, "The Italian navigator has arrived at the shore of the New World."

And so he had.

Fifteen years later on October 4, 1957, when most of this graduating class was in its third year of high school Russian scientists performed the feat of hurling the first earth satellite around the world at 20 times the speed of the sun.

Not since the industrial revolution have the circumstances of life been so changed in such a short period of time. Hiroshima and Nagasaki revolutionized the very concept of war; and ever since, the memory of the mushroom shadow has been a silent arbiter at every conference of major powers and in every international negotiation.

When the first atomic explosion was set off at Alamogordo, N. Mex., in the summer of 1945, two eminent scientists who witnessed its mighty blast are reported to have caught from the fury of its flames what might have been prophetic glimpses. One of them said he thought he saw what the last man on earth would see at the end of time. The other said he thought he caught a trace of the great light that heralded the creation.

Doomsday or creation, twilight or dawn, atomic war or atomic peace—what does the atomic future hold for mankind? Will it mean a tower of strength, prosperity, and happiness or an abyss of submission, destruction, and defeat?

No realistic sketch of the potentialities of the atomic age can be drawn without picturing on one side the possibility of all-out atomic war. This threat figures in the military policy of every nation of the world. Every country having the capability to compete has a crash program aimed at development of a system of long-range ballistic missiles carrying thermonuclear warheads. When this ultimate weapon has been developed, every city in the world will have become a potential target subject to total destruction.

Directly or indirectly, missiles and nuclear weapons touch the daily lives of every man,

woman, and child in this country in every walk of life.

The nuclear facts of life demand a defense posture which requires more appropriations and takes a bigger bite out of the tax dollar than all the other functions of government combined. Defense touches every pocket-book and every bank account. Defense consumes a lion's share of our industrial output. Defense, in theory at least, is the moving force behind Russia's absolute regimentation of all her resources.

The picture I have painted, if gloomy, is nonetheless realistic. The world has never known such broad potentialities for evil as exist today. Nor has it ever had within arm's reach such tools for good.

Potentially a killer, the atom can also be humanitarian. Potentially devastating, it is equally capable of constructive effort.

The atomic age has given mankind his greatest weapons for his war against disease and hunger. Atomic energy offers us a chance to win the fight against poverty. Over one-half the people of the world go to bed hungry every night.

Atomic radiation and radiolotopes offer new opportunities in the field of food production. The free world envisions as a feature of the new force an applied knowledge of photosynthesis which will permit the production of enough food to feed the starving masses of Asia and Africa. The promise of universal abundance automatically removes one of the major causes of war. More important, it holds out the hope that every man born of woman may live a happy, useful life, walking erect among his fellow men as befits the dignity of the image of God.

One of the main obstacles to the development of many of the backward countries of the world has been the lack of local sources of power. At present the average man in North America has about 20 times as much energy to work for him as a man in Asia. Now, in one pound of uranium containing energy of 3 million pounds of coal, the underprivileged peoples of the world have within reach the key to unlock the door to a new age of abundance.

Thus while atomic bombs make the headlines, atomic energy furnishes us with another tool in the battle against disease. While atomic war threatens the desolation of every countryside, atomic peace satisfies man's need for food, water, and power. While hydrogen bombs throw out radioactive dust, radiolotopes are at work in our laboratories rolling back the frontiers of science.

The problems of the atomic age are twofold. First, there is the problem of gearing our technical capabilities to its potentialities. Second, there is the problem of trying to avoid all-out atomic war. Both problems are related and both are complicated by the growing military might of the Soviet Union.

Russia's scientific gains have forced us to an auditing of our past and to a redesign of our plans for the future. This job must be carried on by your generation and its difficulties cannot be minimized. But the difficulty of the task is the measure of your opportunity.

Theodore Roosevelt once said: "The right to live softly is in the end a right not worth having. \* \* \* I have never in my life envied a human being who led an easy life; I have envied a great many people who led difficult lives and led them well."

The potentialities of the atomic age call for an enormous expansion of our scientific, industrial, business, and professional skills. All the great occupations and professions are begging for men and women of training and ability. This gives your generation opportunities to use its talents never before offered to the young people of any era.

Russia is a formidable contestant for leadership in the field of scientific education. By dictatorial allocation of priorities

and benefits, she is graduating enormous numbers of physicists and chemists. This poses a real challenge for business, for Government and for our educational system. In speaking of Fermi's feat, the great nuclear scientist, Dr. Willard F. Libby, said: "We could afford to double our present educational expenditures if it would give us just one more Fermi per generation." Not only the colleges and universities, but the American people are challenged to renew and to redouble their dedication to higher education. Such education, to equip us for life in the atomic age, must not be limited to the development of scientific talents necessary to keep us in the forefront of world wide technological developments. Of equal, if not of greater, importance is the necessity of learning to live in the world which our technicians are creating. This calls for the development of our talents on all fronts, the arts and the humanities as well as the sciences. The one sided, if not warped, trend in Russian education may be the beginning of an over specialization which may eventually lead to her breakdown. If we can sustain and broaden the base of our culture and still set the pace

in technological fields we may uncover the secret to survival in the atomic age.

Our competition from Russia in this dangerous age calls for high skills. It calls also for courage. It calls especially for moral courage. This Nation was born under a resolution that demanded liberty or death. Survival is not the end of existence.

To be worthy to survive as a Nation we must be willing to risk our survival if need be for the freedom and independence of our people.

We cannot win the cold war by retreating. We cannot win it by appeasement. When principles are at stake we must be willing to stand our ground at whatever cost. There is no future in submission. If we cannot survive with honor, we cannot survive at all.

The true spirit of man, without reference to his ideologies, is committed to building the tower. It is man's wandering from his higher purpose which leads him to the abyss.

The hydrogen bomb and the intercontinental ballistic missile have posed tremendous problems in the realms of science, statecraft, and war. They have not, however, altered the basic duties or destiny of man.

They have not changed his relationship with his Creator. With all the astounding achievements made or foreseen or foreseeable in the age of nuclear power and outer space, man's spiritual ideals remain transcendent. The teachings of Christianity still reach infinitely beyond the realms of outer space.

We have come a long way since the days of Moses. We have replaced slingshots with rockets, pushcarts with jetplanes, rowboats with atomic ships, but in all this we have found no substitute for the Ten Commandments.

We have changed the foundations of physical theory; we have challenged the axioms of geometry and disproved them, but the Sermon on the Mount remains as immutable as the "Rock of Ages." The changes in science have served to emphasize, not to undermine it. The Golden Rule was important to the individual in the bow and arrow age; in the age of atomic weapons it is indispensable to the survival of man.

As graduates of a great Christian university you have a rendezvous with destiny. With God's help, you will not fail that rendezvous.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, out of our partial and fragmentary conceptions, knowing that we see as through a glass darkly, we turn to Thee, sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but in Thee.

We acknowledge our share in the world's sin, our love of ease, our pride of race and place and possession, our ruthless competition, our failure to take account of the needs of others, at home and half a world away, and to realize that in very truth humanity is one.

This white altar reared at the gates of the morning speaks to us ever of our final reliance on the supreme spiritual forces—faith, hope, and love—which alone abide, and on which our salvation in the end depends.

Harken to the prayers of our hearts when, in our highest moments, we forget ourselves and think of Thee.

In the spirit of Christ we lift our prayer. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 1, 1962, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT, 1962—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States today

transmitted to the Senate the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, Executive D, 87th Congress, 2d session. As in executive session, I move that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the agreement, that the agreement, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

#### To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, in the English, French, Spanish, and Russian languages, formulated at the United Nations Wheat Conference which concluded at Geneva on March 10, 1962. The agreement was open for signature in Washington from April 19 through May 15, 1962. It was signed in behalf of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of 34 other countries.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State regarding the Agreement. Attention is invited particularly to the last paragraph of that report. It is my hope that the Senate will find it possible to give early consideration to the Agreement so that, if the Agreement be approved, ratification by the United States can be effected and an instrument of acceptance deposited by July 16.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 5, 1962.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope.

### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 1347. An act for the relief of Adolf M. Baller;

H.R. 5652. An act for the relief of Kevork Torolian; and

H.J. Res. 638. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens who are serving in the U.S. Armed Forces.

### LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. SPARKMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT ON CONTRACTS FOR EXPERIMENTAL OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated by that Administration for experimental or research